

*Conference on International
Cultural, Educational, and
Scientific Exchanges*

❖

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
BOARD ON RESOURCES OF AMERICAN LIBRARIES
AND
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BOARD

Conference on International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY — NOVEMBER 25-26, 1946

❖

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDA

BY

EDWIN E. WILLIAMS

RUTH V. NOBLE

RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

CHICAGO
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
1947

This publication was made possible by funds granted by Carnegie Corporation of New York. That Corporation is not, however, the author, owner, publisher, or proprietor of this publication, and is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements made or views expressed therein.

Copyright 1947 by the American Library Association

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



Foreword

At no time in our history have we been more conscious of the need for close cultural and intellectual relations among nations. Any device to further and to improve such relationships helps to build a framework of international peace and understanding. Near the heart of the problem are the varied types of interchanges described and discussed in the present volume.

For the first time, Mr. Williams and Miss Noble have brought together a thorough study of the whole field of international exchanges. Previous writers have concerned themselves with particular aspects, as, for example, exchange of publications between institutions. Now the many facets of the problem have been related to permit us to see the entire picture. As one topic after another is considered, we come to realize their interdependence: adequate national bibliographies must precede indexing and abstracting, and are essential for exchanges of publications, for programs of photoreproduction, and for cooperative acquisition agreements; reconstruction of war-devastated libraries is required to provide national leadership and to rebuild the book resources of the world; exchange of personnel affects all other phases.

It is significant also that a majority of these matters are not new. One of the most valuable features of the Williams-Noble investigation is the historical perspective which it provides. The scholarly review of former efforts in the field, dating back in some instances for several centuries, permits us to examine the current situation more clearly and objectively than would otherwise be possible. On the experience, failures and successes of the past, we may be able to build more effectively and intelligently for the future.

The timeliness of this survey is obvious. The establishment of UNESCO—concerned in large part with the same or similar problems—the pending program among American research libraries for cooperative book acquisition on a world-wide scale, and the multitude of problems left by the war underline the desirability for thoroughgoing consideration of every major issue pertaining to interchanges.

To Carl H. Milam, who originally conceived the idea for the study, and to the Carnegie Corporation, which financed its preparation and contributed toward its publication, should also go a large share of credit for its coming into being.

ROBERT B. DOWNS

March, 1947



Contents

Preface	IX
Recommendations Unanimously Adopted by the Conference	XV
Persons Attending the Conference	XXI
 I. Author Bibliography	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	3
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	11
 II. Subject Bibliography	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	16
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	26
 III. Interlibrary Loan	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	34
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	41
 IV. Photographic Reproduction	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	43
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	50
 V. Cooperative Acquisition and Specialization	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	55
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	64
 VI. International Exchange of Documents	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	72
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	77

VII. Exchanges Between Libraries	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	83
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	93
VIII. International Commercial Exchanges	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	100
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	106
IX. Barriers to International Interchange of Publications	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	109
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	119
X. Exhibits	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	124
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	131
XI. International Exchange of Personnel	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	134
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	141
XII. Rehabilitation	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	144
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	150
Agencies and Priorities	
<i>Preliminary Memorandum</i>	155
<i>Summary of Proceedings</i>	156
Notes	160
Abbreviations	197
Index	201



Preface

The Conference on International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges, which met at Princeton University on November 25 and 26, 1946, was sponsored by the Board on Resources of American Libraries and the International Relations Board, both of the American Library Association. Its purposes can best be indicated by reproducing here a few paragraphs from a memorandum issued over the signatures of the chairmen of the two Boards, Robert B. Downs and Keyes D. Metcalf:

In the text of the Three-Power Statement on Atomic Energy, released in November, 1945, there are various references to the desirability and necessity of interchanging scientific information. "Scientific literature" is mentioned specifically. This is believed to be the first time on record that the heads of three great governments have jointly advocated the exchange of scientific publications. Other evidence pointing in the direction of growing recognition of the importance of international exchanges is the extensive use of scientific publications by the General Staffs; the unprecedented demand made upon libraries by war-time research enterprises; and the regrettable frequency of calls for foreign scientific publications which were not available anywhere in this country; also the attention paid to foreign scientific and technical publications by the Alien Property Custodian; the careful scrutiny and digesting of enemy documents, still in process, and the plans for distribution of information to American industry. As Dr. Vannevar Bush, who coordinated the efforts of American scientists during the second world war, commented, in his July 1945 report to the President, "Adequate technical libraries are an indispensable tool for research workers."

This unprecedented recognition of the essential nature of scientific literature would seem to give librarians an opportunity to develop pro-

grams for the interchange of such literature on a scale never hitherto considered possible.

Another major factor is UNESCO. The Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as adopted in November 1945, states as one of the Organization's primary functions the maintenance, increase, and diffusion of knowledge, "by encouraging cooperation among the nations in all branches of intellectual activity, including the international exchange of persons active in the fields of education, science and culture and the exchange of publications, objects of artistic and scientific interest and other materials of information; (and) by initiating methods of international cooperation calculated to give the people of all countries access to the printed and published materials produced by any of them."

Through this statement of a basic objective, UNESCO has opened up a vast field for cooperation with cultural, educational, and research organizations of the world. The essential question remaining to be answered is how the highly significant aims can be most effectively achieved.

The role to be played by the United States in this and other proposals for international intellectual cooperation will undoubtedly be of first importance because of the advanced state of scientific progress here, our efficiently organized libraries and other cultural and educational institutions, wide previous experience in international exchange of publications, well-developed indexing and abstracting services, and similar factors. To take proper advantage of the opportunities to work through and with UNESCO, and other national and international organizations with similar purposes, however, it is obvious that much study and planning will be required on the part of American librarians and scholars. A large measure of national initiative is essential to the success of any world-wide plan.

After describing the twelve major topics to be considered, the statement continued,

It is appropriate that the United States should assume some leadership in considering these questions. Its own cultural productions were not severely curtailed by the war; its financial and personnel resources are great; its libraries and scholars are now ready to absorb and use the publications of all countries. The next step is to provide some mechanism whereby librarians and scholars may give over-all consideration to the opportunities presented and to the problems which confront us. For several reasons, it is believed that a conference of carefully selected scholars, scientists and librarians would accomplish more than any other plan. Such

a conference would save time, would provide group support for any program adopted, and would generate numerous ideas which would not come out in any individual investigation because the participants would stimulate each other.

A grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to cover the cost of preparing preliminary memoranda and publishing the proceedings made it possible for the two ALA Boards to proceed with plans for the meeting. Mimeographed sets of the Preliminary Memoranda were mailed on November 13 to those who had indicated their intention of attending. Not all of those who had been invited found it possible to be present.

The Memoranda are reproduced here in substantially their original form. A few very brief additions have been made that were suggested too late for incorporation in the mimeographed version, and some of the most obvious of the questions suggested for discussion have been deleted. It may be desirable to quote from the explanation with which they were prefaced by their authors, Edwin E. Williams and Ruth V. Noble:

The twelve subjects are so closely related that there seems to be no completely logical order in which they can be arranged. The authors of the memoranda have thought it best to begin with fundamental bibliographical problems involved in the recording and location of library materials, including selective and national bibliography, union catalogues and lists, and cooperative cataloguing, followed by subject bibliography, including indexing and abstracting. Interlibrary loan, the classic form of library cooperation, will be considered next, followed by photographic reproduction, which was inaugurated chiefly as a substitute for loan, but which rapidly became much more than that.

Acquisition problems include proposals for coordinated and cooperative programs involving library specialization. One cooperative method of acquisition is by exchange between governments and libraries of documents, current serials, and duplicates; interchange of publications through commercial channels is also to be considered. Major obstacles to international interchange of publications include questions of copyright, postage, and tariff regulations. Two methods of exchanging information otherwise than by means of publications will then be treated: exhibits and exchange of personnel. The problem of rehabilitating war devastated libraries has been left for the end of the series, because a reconstruction program

ought to be based on—and ought to further—the long-term objectives to be considered in connection with the other memoranda.

Work on these memoranda was begun early in August, and there has not been time for leisurely and careful collection, examination, and digestion, of the very numerous books and articles that have been devoted to some of the subjects in question. The brief summary memoranda that follow are designed to remind those who attend the conference of what they know already, and to suggest a few of the questions they may wish to discuss. Bibliographical footnotes have been included in order to facilitate investigation by the reader of any points that are of particular interest to him. . . .

The authors are indebted for suggestions to those who were kind enough to read some of these memoranda before they were mimeographed: Messrs. Downs and Metcalf of the ALA Boards on Resources and International Relations, Mr. E. W. McDiarmid, Jr., President of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, and Mr. Paul North Rice, Executive Secretary of the Association of Research Libraries. Miss Ivander MacIver of the University of California Library supplied valuable information on exchanges, and the staff of the ALA International Relations Office in Washington was very helpful in facilitating the exploration of its files.

Messrs. Downs and Metcalf alternated in presiding over the discussion at Princeton. A stenotype record was kept, and the summary which is printed here represents a condensation of this to little more than one-fourth of its full length.

It ought to be observed that an honest summary of unrehearsed discussion cannot result in a series of polished essays. It should also be admitted that after a man's words have passed through the hands of a stenotypist unfamiliar with the subject, and her transcription, in turn, has been abstracted, they may not perfectly reproduce his thought. For that matter, remarks made in the course of free discussion, often with the purpose of stimulating others to express their views, may not always, even in the original, express the opinions a man would support in a signed article or, of course, the opinions with which he left Princeton.

The Recommendations were prepared by a committee which attempted, after each session, to express the consensus of opinion on major topics, regardless of whether or not a formal motion had been passed. The final session of the conference was devoted to painstaking examination of these Recommendations. The discussion at

this last session has not been summarized here because the committee appears to have done its work so well that only verbal changes to clarify a few points were found necessary before their unanimous adoption.

Finally, it should be reported that, in addition to the Recommendations, the following resolutions were accepted by acclamation:

RESOLVED,

That the Conference note with whole-hearted approval the fine spirit in which the Library of Congress has aided the research interests of American scholars and libraries. The Union Catalogue, *The United States Quarterly Book List*, cooperative cataloguing—indeed, all of the bibliographical enterprises of the Library of Congress—are of value to research and scholarship both here and abroad. We commend the Librarian of Congress and his staff for their genuine interest in and support of so many worth-while enterprises. The Library of Congress has become and should continue to be a true national library.

That the Conference express its cordial appreciation to Dr. and Mrs. Julian Boyd and Princeton University for their hospitality and for arranging for this group to meet here.

That the Conference express its thanks to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the generous financial support provided for preliminary preparation for the Conference and for publication of the results.

That the Harvard University Library be thanked for releasing Mr. Williams to undertake preparation of the Preliminary Memoranda, and that both Mr. Williams and Miss Noble be commended for their services.

That the Conference commend the two committees which have cooperated in calling this Conference, the Board on Resources of American Libraries and the International Relations Board, and, especially, the two chairmen who have worked so hard to make the Conference a success.

The manuscript of this volume was read by Messrs. Downs and Metcalf, and Miss Noble helped with both revision and proofreading; but the responsibility for errors and for expanses of aridity ought to be borne by

E.E.W.



Recommendations Unanimously Adopted by the Conference

The free interchange of cultural, scientific, and educational information is one of the most critical needs of the world today. Society's progress depends upon the extent to which scholars and scientists of the world have free access to all sources of information and research. International understanding, fundamental to international good will, depends upon the extent to which cultural materials of all nations are available to all other nations. Intelligent and informed world opinion depends upon the wide dissemination of educational materials. This conference, dedicated to the extension and improvement of the channels of communication between libraries and scholars of all nations, makes the following recommendations:

1. The objective in bibliography is to make quickly available in published form suitable records of the current output by all countries of publications of research value. Without prejudice to retrospective bibliography, in which we are also deeply interested, we recommend that UNESCO and other suitable agencies and groups, governmental and nongovernmental, encourage national governments, national library associations, and other agencies in every country to see to it that there is published for each country a current national bibliography, which will include in an author arrangement under broad subjects, in one or more sections or parts, the following types of material, listed in the order of their importance:
 - a. Books and pamphlets
 - b. Government documents at all levels
 - c. Nongovernment periodicals
 - d. Newspapers, and if possible

- e. Miscellaneous publications
 - f. Motion pictures, including news reels, documentaries, instructional films, and photoplays.
2. We believe there is a place and need for both selective and comprehensive national bibliographies, but because of their fundamental importance we recommend that priority be given to securing bibliographies of the comprehensive type.
 3. It is recommended that the Library of Congress formulate and present to ALA, ARL, SLA, and other library associations in this country, for their comment and criticism, plans for editing and publishing a complete current national bibliography of the United States, involving as may be necessary the coordination of existing efforts in this field, such as the catalogues of the Superintendent of Documents, the *Monthly Checklist of State Publications*, *Cumulative Book Index*, *Catalogue of Copyright Entries*, and other sources, and looking to the coverage of fields not now covered, such as municipal documents, house organs, etc.
 4. In the periodical field the following steps are recommended:
 - a. That the U.S. National Commission propose to UNESCO the preparation of a world list of periodicals, noting those that are included in indexing and abstracting services, and appending a subject list of such services. The list should include full bibliographical details for each title, and, further, should indicate which journals are available on an exchange basis.
 - b. That the U.S. National Commission bring to the attention of the United States delegates to UNESCO the need and desirability of greater international cooperation in the preparation of subject indexing and abstracting services.
 - c. That the Library of Congress prepare a list of holdings of United States libraries in wartime periodicals, exclusive of those originating in the British Isles and the Western hemisphere, and make it available as the basis for a want list, republication order list, etc.
 5. We urge the Library of Congress to continue and push forward as rapidly as possible its program for development of the National Union Catalogue, including the incorporation of entries

from the *American Imprints Inventory*, because of the union catalogue's primary importance to national and international library cooperation.

6. We recommend to the ALA that it proceed with the compilation and publication of the proposed bibliographical guide to American library resources, to increase our knowledge of the field and our potentialities for cooperation.
7. In the field of photographic reproduction, we recommend the establishment of a central agency, or agencies, possibly reconstituting the Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning, to deal with such matters as:
 - a. Coordinating the reissue of journals and other materials needed by American and foreign libraries
 - b. Determining what titles are in sufficient demand internationally to produce in the original size, in reduced facsimile, or by microfilm
 - c. Advising on what masses of archives and rare books, here and abroad, should be reproduced on microfilm
 - d. Making technical studies on such problems as comparative costs of reproduction by various processes.
8. We believe that international interlibrary loans should be encouraged but, because of the hazards of transportation, should be largely in the form of photographic reproductions. This method has the further advantage of wider dissemination of materials.
9. We recommend that steps be taken by the ARL to bring the Farmington Plan into effect as soon as possible on an experimental basis, and to expand its scope rapidly to include additional countries, non-Roman alphabets, and periodical material, government documents, and other nontrade book materials. All acquisitions should be reported to the National Union Catalogue as an author control, and libraries specializing in broad subject fields should undertake, in cooperation with the appropriate scholarly organizations, to prepare and publish subject bibliographies, if it is evident that they would prove useful.
10. We request the Librarian of Congress, the Executive Secretary of the ARL, and the Chairman of the ALA Board on Resources to study the problems involved in, and if practicable arrange

for, obtaining additional sets of foreign government publications for distribution to selected American libraries outside Washington, coordinating the distribution with the Farmington Plan.

11. We recommend to the State Department that American libraries abroad be supplied with lists of United States government publications distributed in countries where these libraries are located, and that the possibility be studied of making the libraries official partial depositories and sales agencies for federal documents.
12. In considering the accomplishments of the American Book Center and the prospective usefulness of such an organization, this group feels that studies should be made immediately looking toward the adaptation of ABC into an agency to coordinate, in so far as seems necessary, exchange in all of its manifestations of materials among American libraries, to develop programs for the transmission of American informational materials to libraries in foreign countries, with priorities for those countries that have suffered most from the war, and, further, that priorities be given to sending materials to foreign peoples that will inform them on developments in this country since the outbreak of the war, knowledge of which has not hitherto been available to them, and, further, that ABC take affirmative and vigorous action toward encouraging and coordinating institutional exchanges between this country and the rest of the world, and that, in this connection, the cooperation of the government be secured in obtaining documents of foreign governments for distribution in this country, along the lines of the Farmington proposal.
13. We recommend that representatives of the Association of Research Libraries and the Board on Resources confer with Smithsonian Institution officials on speedier and more efficient methods of forwarding exchange materials.
14. We strongly endorse the State Department plan for exchange of librarians and other personnel included in its cultural relations program. We urge adoption by Congress of legislation providing for continuation and extension outside the Western hemisphere of this activity.
15. We believe that the interests of research workers in this country

will be best served by maintaining as a unit the publications in the Washington Documents Center (for Eastern materials), and by the transfer of this unit to the Library of Congress at the earliest possible moment, in order that these valuable records may become available to scholars.

16. We believe that the needs of scholars and scientists in this country require the resumption of normal cultural, educational, and scientific relations with former enemy countries as promptly as possible and the removal of all barriers to the international exchange of information.
17. We believe that provisions similar to those of the "gentlemen's agreement" (reached in 1935 between the Joint Committee on Materials for Research and the National Association of Book Publishers) should be incorporated in the copyright laws; we reaffirm the principles approved by the U.S. National Commission regarding dissemination of and access to information; and we urge that a continuing study of international barriers with a view to the removal of such barriers, be made by an appropriate group, which should work closely with UNESCO and other agencies concerned with these problems.
18. We believe translations are important and recommend the extension and development of this field, with publication of information on printed translations.
19. We recommend to the State and Treasury Departments that American libraries be entirely exempted from customs barriers and costs, including the general requirement that consular invoices be presented for import shipments of library printed materials, such exemption being possible under existing statutes.
20. We recommend that the International Relations Board be encouraged to arrange for exhibitions of foreign books in American libraries and of American books abroad, and to investigate means of accomplishing this aim.
21. We commend highly the free American libraries abroad, established by the Department of State and other agencies, for the important contributions they have made to the spread of American culture and to foreign understanding of this country, and we urge Congress to assure their continuation on an adequate scale and with sufficient American personnel. We also recom-

- mend that experience with these libraries be competently and thoroughly studied and evaluated by American librarians.
22. In view of the great destruction of printed materials and the increasing flow of publications abroad, we believe that all countries should consider plans for coordination of acquisitions and the development of subject fields in their libraries, and recommend that the United States delegation to UNESCO actively support such efforts.
 23. We recommend that the American Library Association and other American Documentation Institute members take steps to revive and renovate the Institute to serve as the American effective member of the International Federation for Documentation.
 24. We recommend that the ARL and the Library of Congress Planning Committee study, with a view to presenting it to the U.S. National Commission, the Boyd proposal for establishment of a National Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Authority in the United States.



Persons Attending the Conference

- JAMES T. BABB, Librarian, Yale University Library
RALPH A. BEALS, Director, New York Public Library
GABRIEL A. BERNARDO, Librarian, University of the Philippines
JULIAN P. BOYD, Librarian, Princeton University Library
CHARLES H. BROWN, Associate Librarian, Iowa State College Library
(Member, International Relations Board)
LEON CARNOVSKY, Associate Dean, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago (Member, International Relations Board)
VERNER W. CLAPP, Director, Acquisitions Department, Library of Congress
DAVID H. CLIFT, Associate Librarian, Yale University Library
CHARLES W. DAVID, Director of Libraries, University of Pennsylvania
ROBERT B. DOWNS, Director, University of Illinois Library and Library School (Chairman, Board on Resources)
LUTHER H. EVANS, Librarian of Congress
CHARLES B. FAHS, Rockefeller Foundation
THOMAS P. FLEMING, Assistant Director, Columbia University Libraries (Chairman, Joint Committee on Importations)
JOHN E. FLYNN, Editor, *Biological Abstracts*
RICHARD H. HEINDEL, Chief, Division of Libraries and Institutes, Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State
CARL W. E. HINTZ, Librarian, Chicago Museum of Natural History (Member, Board on Resources)
ROBERT M. LESTER, Secretary, Carnegie Corporation of New York
FLORA B. LUDINGTON, Librarian, Mount Holyoke College Library (Chairman, International Relations Board)

E. W. McDIARMID, JR., Librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries and Director of Library Instruction (President, Association of College and Reference Libraries)

KEYES D. METCALF, Director, Harvard University Library (Retiring Chairman, International Relations Board)

MARION A. MILCZEWSKI, Director, ALA International Relations Office

RUTH V. NOBLE (Co-author of Preliminary Memoranda for the Conference)

REUBEN PEISS, Library of Congress Mission

PAUL NORTH RICE, Chief, Reference Department, New York Public Library (Executive Secretary, Association of Research Libraries, and President-elect, ALA; Member, Board on Resources)

KENNETH R. SHAFFER, Director, Simmons College School of Library Science (Former Executive Director, American Book Center)

RALPH R. SHAW, Librarian, U.S. Department of Agriculture Library

T. W. SIMPSON, Civil Affairs Division, U.S. War Department

JOHN VAN MALE, Librarian, Mary Reed Library, and Assistant Director of Libraries, University of Denver (Chairman, Bibliography Committee)

ROBERT G. VOSPER, Head, Accessions Department, University of California at Los Angeles Library

CARL M. WHITE, Director, Columbia University Libraries

EDWIN E. WILLIAMS, Assistant to the Librarian, Harvard College Library (In charge of preparing Preliminary Memoranda)

DONALD YOUNG, Research Secretary, Social Science Research Council

*Conference on International
Cultural, Educational, and
Scientific Exchanges*

Author Bibliography

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

Because they both deal with methods of recording and locating library materials, the first two memoranda in this series must be very closely related. Many compilations and catalogues list materials by subject as well as by author, but it seems possible to select for comment here those bibliographical enterprises that are chiefly useful from the author or main entry approach, and to leave for the second memorandum a consideration of indexes, abstracts, classification problems, and other matters related to subject listing.

In justification of the belief that it is appropriate to begin this series by an examination of bibliographical problems, it may be sufficient to point out that listing and location of materials are, to some extent, prerequisite to almost any other form of library cooperation, and that the extent to which other activities can be developed may be determined by the bibliographical foundation on which they can be built.

The basic nature of the problems was recognized at the first meeting of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, and bibliography was the field of one of the first subcommittees appointed by that organization.¹ Bishop has written that, "in practical bibliography, both national and subject, lies the first and most important step in the world of books toward international understanding,"² and the Librarian of Congress, declaring that "the future availability of knowledge for the whole world is . . . bound up with the bibliographical planning we do," has called upon UNESCO to adopt "a most ambitious bibliographical program."³

Selective Bibliography. — Selective or critical bibliography has always had its advocates, such as Funck-Brentano at Brussels in 1897⁴ and Chilovi in 1904;⁵ but it needs to be considered in this memorandum chiefly as a means of furthering international understanding. One of the projects of the IIIC was an annual list of best books.⁶ In 1928, thirty-three nations contributed (proportionally to their total book production) from two to forty titles each to this; later it was recommended that nations be encouraged to select and publish more extensive lists with emphasis on books significant as expressions of national tendencies.⁷ Still later it was announced that many national libraries were prepared to advise on the purchase of best books from their countries.⁸

In the Latin American field, selective bibliographies were included in the plans of the Inter-American Book Exchange⁹ and were recommended by the Havana conference of 1928.¹⁰ The ALA Committee on Library Cooperation with Latin America interested itself in a list of books on Latin America for North American readers, as well as in book selection aids for libraries south of the border.¹¹

The war stimulated production of a number of such lists,¹² including the British Council list of one thousand books published since 1939, the American McCombs list and its supplement, and the Hawkins scientific list sponsored by the National Research Council. In May 1945 the first issue of *The United States Quarterly Book List*, "intended to illustrate the best current literary and learned production of the United States," was published by the Library of Congress. The Office of War Information issued a monthly book list for the use of library and cultural centre personnel abroad.¹³

The scholarly applications of selective bibliography in special fields will be considered in the second memorandum. Lists of the sort in question here can always be accused of being either too popular or too scholarly. Any single list for foreign use is difficult to compile because, while there is a general reading public for English in some countries, scholars are chiefly to be served in others.

Should the publication of different lists for different areas be recommended? Is it preferable to have such lists compiled by private agencies, as were the McCombs list and its predecessors on interpreting America, rather than by agencies of the government? The former method is less suggestive of propaganda and may avoid limitations

imposed by official timidity, but the government appears to be the most probable source of financial support for a permanent service. Can the ALA *Booklist* and other domestic book selection services be developed to meet foreign needs? Can universities collaborate on the production of lists? Can cooperative preparation and sponsorship be arranged with nations for which lists are intended? For example, could a list of American books for English libraries be selected by a joint Anglo-American committee and published by a British agency, while the same committee would select English books for the United States? Could UNESCO promote the adoption of bilateral agreements of this kind if they seem desirable?

National Bibliography.—The first English national bibliography is believed to have appeared in 1548,¹⁴ and there were seventeenth-century attempts at universal world bibliography;¹⁵ the second year of the revolution brought a plan for a French national bibliography that would also have served as a printed national union catalogue.¹⁶ The conference of 1895 which led to the formation of IIB concerned itself with both universal bibliography and a world union catalogue, but by that time national bibliography had become so well established that it was accepted as the natural foundation for more grandiose schemes.¹⁷

The same viewpoint was evident at the International Publishers Congress of 1899 which advocated the standardization of national lists because they should serve as the basis for all other bibliographies.¹⁸ With similar considerations in mind, publication of national bibliographies on cards was recommended by the Paris congress of 1900¹⁹ and the Rome conference of 1929;²⁰ other authorities have recommended publication in a form suitable for clipping and pasting.²¹ Although there has been general agreement since the latter part of the nineteenth century that each nation must be expected to take responsibility for its own national bibliography, there has not been agreement on form, and little progress in standardization has been made.

There has also been diversity, both theoretical and practical, in the source of national bibliography. Campbell,²² Ansteinsson,²³ and others have thought the national library the logical agency. One reason for this theory is the privilege of legal (or copyright) deposit enjoyed by many such libraries. Government publication might also

be expected to facilitate international exchange of bibliographies, as recommended by a League of Nations committee in 1924.²⁴

In Germany, where there was no central legal deposit, the publishers themselves instituted their own library, attempted with very considerable success to collect all new publications, and made themselves responsible for the national bibliography.²⁵ Publishers of other nations have not followed this example. In the United States, it might be said that several of the possible sources of publication are involved—the *Publishers' Weekly* provides the current weekly list; the H. W. Wilson Company, an individual publisher, issues the *CBI*; and the government, by means of the *Catalogue of Copyright Entries* and Library of Congress printed cards, is also a major contributor to current national bibliography.

Current world book production is not adequately covered by present national bibliographies. American librarians have, perhaps, been particularly conscious of the gaps in Latin American bibliography,²⁶ and there have been proposals that this country try to remedy the situation. Gropp urged that an agency of the United States government become a depository of all current Latin American publications,²⁷ and Milam has suggested that one copy of every Latin American book be acquired somewhere in this country.²⁸

Perhaps even more serious gaps are to be found in retrospective national bibliography. Great Britain and the United States are among the great majority of nations whose book production has not been adequately listed, though the printed catalogues of the British Museum and the Library of Congress help to compensate for the deficiency.

There have been many resolutions and recommendations urging development by each nation of its own bibliography. Can any more effective action be taken now, possibly through UNESCO?

Should a survey be made of the adequacy of national bibliography throughout the world, both current and retrospective? Is UNESCO the appropriate agency to sponsor such a study?

Current bibliography of the United States may call for special consideration by Americans. Richardson estimated in 1925 that 135,000 volumes and pamphlets were appearing annually that might be worth keeping by libraries, of which only 8,000 were listed in the trade. He also estimated that only 5 per cent of all pamphlets were being copy-

righted, yet the *Catalogue of Copyright Entries* listed 37,000 titles, of which only 20,000 were kept by the Library of Congress.²⁹ At best, as Evans points out, "the *C.B.I.* fails to include many private and research publications and excludes all government published books and pamphlets."³⁰

In the discussion of copyright it will be noted that American copyright deposit is considerably less inclusive than complete *dépôt légal* by both printers and publishers as instituted in France, but it is doubtful that there is any constitutional basis other than copyright by which deposit could be secured in this country.

Union Catalogues and Lists.—Union catalogues may be almost as ancient as any other form of bibliography, for the libraries of Alexandria at the time of Callimachus may have had such a catalogue, and the British *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiae* was compiled about 1296. This was revised in the fifteenth century (each library was given a number), and a Belgian union catalogue of manuscripts dates from the same period.³¹ Langbaine proposed a union catalogue of Oxford libraries in 1651,³² and in 1697 Bernard prepared a union catalogue of 22,640 English manuscripts in 110 libraries.³³ The French revolutionary project of Domergue and Grégoire has already been mentioned.

The English may have been pioneers in this field, but they were not very active during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In recent years, however, they have developed a remarkable system of regional union catalogues in connection with outlier libraries of the National Central Library.³⁴ It should be noted that postwar plans before the Library Association call for specialist union catalogues for research purposes, rather than for a national general union catalogue.³⁵

Until the last few years at least, the greatest progress in union cataloguing of research collections had been in Germany, where early proposals for such efforts were made in 1785³⁶ and where Goethe had supported a union catalogue of Weimar libraries.³⁷ The *Gesamtkatalog* has been described repeatedly,³⁸ and its utility as an aid to interlibrary loan will be considered later. When interrupted by the war, it was beginning to list library holdings of 35,000,000 volumes and had more than three hundred subscribers.

Union catalogues in Hungary,³⁹ Switzerland,⁴⁰ and other countries

need not be described here, and a proposed Latin American union catalogue at the Pan American Union has not materialized.⁴¹ Several union catalogues and lists have been compiled in Latin America, however, some of them with the assistance of librarians from the United States.⁴²

The American union catalogue dates from the first printing of cards by the Library of Congress and their exchange for printed cards of other libraries. During the years following the first world war, expansion or completion of the American catalogue was a major feature in the programs of the ALI and of the ALA Bibliography Committee.⁴³ A Rockefeller grant-in-aid in 1927 made it possible to expand the catalogue, by 1932, to 8,344,000 entries for 6,775,000 works.⁴⁴ An informal conference on union catalogues was held at the Library of Congress in 1936⁴⁵ and an important volume on the subject was edited by Downs in 1942. There seems to be almost universal agreement that no cooperative activity is more desirable than continued expansion of this catalogue, which may later be published in book form. Publication of the LC printed cards in book form has facilitated checking by libraries that wish to report holdings for which cards have not been issued, and this is giving further impetus to the movement, though progress was slowed down by wartime conditions.⁴⁶

The availability of clerical labor for relief projects during the depression encouraged development of regional union catalogues in the United States, and their status has been considered at length in the Downs volume.⁴⁷ From the international standpoint, however, such catalogues seem to be of secondary importance since requests and inquiries from abroad should be directed to Washington, and, except in so far as their records are incorporated in the national catalogue or they are consulted by circularization, regional centres will not be involved. (See, however, Mr. David's comments, page 15.) Union catalogues in subject fields are also listed in the Downs volume, and catalogues and lists of manuscripts,⁴⁸ incunabula, and other special classes of material should not be overlooked.

It should be observed also that specialization by libraries in subject fields may increase the importance of regional union lists. Another means of making the most of regional and special lists would be provided by the compilation, as recently suggested by Downs and approved by the ALA Board on Resources, of a bibliographical guide

to American library resources which would cover printed library catalogues, union lists, descriptions of special collections, surveys of libraries, guides to archives and manuscripts, and similar works useful to the scholar, research worker, and student, including important unpublished items.

A special field for union catalogue development was pointed out when Milam and Lydenberg, after their Latin American trip of 1944, recommended the compilation of union catalogues of United States books and periodicals in Latin American cities where American institutes are located.⁴⁹

Proposals for world union catalogues antedate the successful establishment of national catalogues. During the British Museum hearings of 1850, exchange between governments of stereotype plates for catalogue entries was proposed with the object of creating a universal catalogue of books printed to 1838.⁵⁰ Downs, looking into the future, has suggested that the same objective might be reached by exchange of microfilm,⁵¹ and the Cultural Institutions Round Table of the American National Commission on Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, reporting on September 26, 1946, has recommended careful study of the possibility of a world union catalogue.⁵² This may seem premature, but it is true that librarians of this country are not disposed to let completion of the national union catalogue wait on completion of a system of regional lists.

Probably because serials are a relatively recent medium for dissemination of the results of research, union lists of serials appear to date only from 1859.⁵³ Such lists, however, multiplied so rapidly that eighty years later Mummendey could list 281 of them,⁵⁴ and the American *ULS* is undoubtedly much more nearly complete than the American union catalogue.

The importance of union catalogues and lists in any program of interlibrary loan is self-evident, both as a means of locating a single copy of a book and, whenever multiple copies are to be found, as a means of distributing the burden of loan over many libraries. Their uses as a stimulus to coordinated acquisition and to exchange are somewhat more debatable and must be considered in connection with these subjects.⁵⁵ It may be added that union lists can be extremely helpful in surveying research resources either of individual libraries or of nations as a whole.

Cooperative Cataloguing.—Finally, one potential use of the union catalogue ought to be mentioned—its use as a means of producing cooperative cataloguing. This, of course, was in Jewett's mind as early as 1850 when he presented his plan "for stereotyping catalogues by separate titles; and for forming a general stereotyped catalogue of public libraries in the United States."⁵⁶ By 1902, Jahr and Strohm were able to prepare a bibliography listing 366 items on coöperative cataloguing.⁵⁷ Library of Congress printed cards, plus those prepared by the cooperative cataloguing project, represent a great achievement in this field, as do the cards issued in Russia,⁵⁸ Norway,⁵⁹ and other countries, but many early hopes have not materialized. If modern methods for sorting punched cards or microfilms automatically and reproducing them photographically had been at Jewett's disposal, one wonders if he would not have been more successful.

There have been many proposals for exchange of catalogue cards between libraries,⁶⁰ some of them on an international basis,⁶¹ as well as for the issuance of cards by publishers.⁶² Finally, in recent years, Rider⁶³ and Ellsworth⁶⁴ have proposed the preparation of union catalogues that would also serve as catalogues of the individual libraries included.

Standardization.—A great hindrance in the development of any such scheme domestically, and an even greater handicap to international efforts, is the diversity of catalogue rules. Hopes for international agreement rose in 1908 with the publication of the Anglo-American rules⁶⁵ (though it had been thirty years since the first suggestion that an agreement be reached), and the IIB tried to use these as a basis for a universal code.⁶⁶ Not very much has been accomplished. At the West Baden conference there were proposals that uniform rules be adopted for this country and Mexico.⁶⁷ The subject was considered at the Rome meeting in 1929, when Tobolka pointed out the need, in connection with union catalogues, for identical card format, abbreviations, transliteration, and entry rules.⁶⁸ Committees of both the IID and CIB headed by Prinzhorn considered format, abbreviations, and alphabetization,⁶⁹ while another CIB committee under Metcalf was assigned the subject of catalogue rules.⁷⁰ The problem was discussed by the FID in Paris in October 1946⁷¹ and has been recommended by Bourgeois, Donker Duyvis, and Milam for consideration by the CIB at Oslo.⁷²

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Downs opened the discussion by emphasizing the fact that lack of information on the publishing output of various countries is a major obstacle to international exchanges. He called attention to serious gaps throughout Latin America, in the Far East, and in most minor countries, adding that the situation is even worse retrospectively than for current publishing. Italian national bibliography, for example, is almost a blank from 1500 to 1850, and even in the United States and Great Britain the record is incomplete.

The different kinds of bibliography in question were enumerated by Mr. Metcalf. Lists can be selective or inclusive, can cover American or foreign material, and can be either current or retrospective; moreover, they can be produced either by governments or by private organizations. He suggested that, no matter how great the interest of American librarians in older material, their immediate responsibility is for current lists. Likewise, though they may be equally interested in learning what has been published abroad, their first responsibility is for recording American publications.

A fairly good job is being done for this country, he thought, by the Library of Congress, with its printed cards, and the book trade, with the *Publishers' Weekly* and the *CBI*. UNESCO, he suggested, might properly be asked to attempt to stimulate production of national bibliographies abroad. He hoped that each nation could be persuaded to arrange for both selective and complete listing of its own production.

Mr. White agreed that, if a formula for handling current material could first be devised, the prospects would be improved for going back and listing older publications. Mr. Peiss added that neglect of current bibliography means the accumulation of a constantly growing backlog that must eventually be handled. He also suggested that the Farmington proposal will require a reasonably complete bibliographical basis. Although relatively inclusive current bibliographies can be produced in some countries, selective lists are the most that can be hoped for from others at present; it may be true, however, that in many of these latter countries American research libraries would be satisfied with acquiring only a good selection of current publications.

Referring to the figures cited in the Memorandum (pages 6-7), Mr.

Babb wondered if further effort at home is not needed. Mr. Downs suggested that the lack of any adequate definition of a book may account for some of the discrepancy between the figures given by the *Publishers' Weekly* and by the U.S. Copyright Office, and Mr. Williams added that thousands of advertising circulars may be included in Richardson's figure of 135,000.

Mr. White believed that it would be unwise for all the suppressed bibliographical desires of the world to look toward UNESCO for their fulfillment. He doubted that UNESCO could solve local problems such as national bibliography; it is essential that America lead the way and try to take care of its own portion of the total problem. UNESCO might become a supernational operating agency with an enormous budget, but it seemed more probable that it would stimulate, coordinate, and (in the right sense of that term) oversee cultural projects.

In a Latin American country, for example, it might be appropriate for UNESCO to supply personnel, consultants, and possibly subsidies for a limited period, in order to help start the production of a current national bibliography; but any long-term commitments should be avoided.

Mr. Downs wondered if some of the more backward countries would undertake national bibliographies without a good deal of outside stimulus. Mr. White shared that doubt, but thought there are enough problems that lend themselves to immediate attack to absorb all available resources.

Mr. David reported that he had recently conferred with two members of UNESCO's Preparatory Commission, Mr. Carter, Counsellor for Libraries and Museums, and Mr. Besterman, Counsellor for Bibliography. His impression was that both felt they were on uncertain ground and in no position to make firm commitments. At the time Mr. David was in Paris, the Director-General for UNESCO had not been appointed and there was no general outline of policies. A good many people were very sceptical of the whole future of the organization, and its probable financial resources were not known. Mr. David's own view was that finance was the essence of the problem; there is enough intelligence and good will among the scholars of the world to carry out the international bibliographical enterprises that are needed if sufficient money can be found.

It was also generally believed, he said, that UNESCO would be required to act through already existing agencies wherever possible, and Messrs. Carter and Besterman had appeared to feel that, in the area to be discussed at Princeton, the logical operating agency would be the FID.

There was general agreement that FID ought to be radically reorganized, enlarged, and rejuvenated. Mr. Charles Le Maistre of London had been elected to the FID presidency at the Paris meeting which Mr. David attended, and it had been agreed that there should be four or five vice-presidents, one of whom would be an American. A widely representative committee of eight had also been appointed to prepare for the reconstitution of the organization. Preliminary discussion seemed to point toward a federation made up of a group of committees or chapters, each representing a single nation. Membership would be by chapters not by individuals.

Mr. David, though present only as an observer, had been appointed to this committee of eight, and had been urged to proceed on his return to this country with the organization of a United States committee or chapter. American representation on a number of proposed international committees was also anticipated.

Mr. Boyd believed that deliberations at Princeton should not be restricted because of any hesitance on the part of UNESCO as to its future functions; the major problems should be considered and plans made for their solution regardless of whether either FID or UNESCO could be expected to take an important part in the task. Possibly it would be desirable for UNESCO or some other international agency to tackle selective bibliography, leaving inclusive listing to local or national resources, with such encouragement as Mr. White had suggested. Selective bibliography would have to be compiled by scholars familiar with the material, but it would be a field in which an international organization might hope to achieve important results in a relatively short time. Perhaps, for example, UNESCO could do for international selective bibliography what the Library of Congress with its admirable *Quarterly Book List* has done for this country.

Mr. White suggested that the language problem would arise in international selective bibliography. He preferred to think of UNESCO as an over-all planning body, not as a substitute for local

or private activity. Mr. Boyd wondered if the language problem would be any less serious if the work were left to national agencies.

In response to a question, Mr. Boyd stated his belief that, since this country is going to have considerable weight in determining UNESCO policies, American views should be formulated firmly and exactly in order, if possible, to influence UNESCO. He doubted that this country would have an equally great influence on FID, even as reconstituted.

Mr. Metcalf suggested that the conference might wish to go on record as believing that first emphasis ought to be placed on current bibliography, might express its interest in both selective and complete lists, and might ask for an expression from the Library of Congress as to what it hopes to be able to do in the field of American bibliography. It would be desirable that, at least, it continue its book list and that it reproduce cards for current acquisitions in book form, possibly listing new United States publications separately. The conference might also wish to have a letter sent to all foreign library associations, branches of the FID, and national libraries; such a letter would tell what American librarians think is desirable and ask what the recipient is prepared to do. It might also suggest that the agencies in each country confer and attempt to work out a national plan. Finally, the conference might wish to report to UNESCO what had been done and ask for the cooperation of that organization.

Mr. Brown pointed out that, while the Kayser and Hinrichs bibliographies cite German scientific series, the *CBI* does not list serials, many of which are extremely difficult to locate in this country. He suggested that a national bibliography ought to list all new periodicals for each year. Mr. Flynn agreed that it is very hard to assemble such information at present.

In response to the Chairman's invitation to speak on the union catalogue problem, Mr. Van Male remarked that one difficulty in operating a large union catalogue arises from the lack of agreement on proper author entries. This seemed to suggest that regional union catalogues for areas using similar cataloguing methods would be preferable to an international catalogue.

Mr. Shaw's understanding of the UNESCO proposal for an international union list of serials was that this list would attempt to show only one holding in each area; its primary purpose would be to show

what serials are in existence, thus meeting the need that had been noted by Mr. Brown. This would make it unnecessary for each nation to build up its own list, but any nation could easily, if it wished, convert the headings to its own chosen form and check the international list in order to determine the holdings of its own libraries. He believed that UNESCO should do this job if no one else can be found to do it, but the result would not be a substitute for national or local union catalogues.

Mr. David, referring to the statement on page 8 of the Memorandum that, from the international standpoint, regional union catalogues seem to be of secondary importance, stated that the Philadelphia catalogue constantly receives inquiries from abroad. He thought it logical that such inquiries should go to Washington, as suggested in the Memorandum, but many of them do not go there now.

Miss Ludington, who had recently returned from India, reported that pamphlets and documents are the most important media of publication in the social sciences there. Moreover, none of the Indian provinces issue lists, there are no national bibliographical or copyright services, and it is impossible to discover what becomes of copyright deposit books.

Mr. Vosper added that a memorandum prepared at the University of California states that "the pattern of national bibliography is familiar to the countries of Europe and the Western Hemisphere. We feel that particular emphasis is now needed to familiarize all of the Asiatic countries with this pattern." Other members of the conference called attention to similar needs in South America, Africa, and Australia. Mr. Vosper also believed that American national bibliography is inadequate and reported that the University of California had gone on record as hoping that the Library of Congress or the ALA would undertake a complete listing.

Mr. Shaffer emphasized the disparity in bibliographical incentive between one country and another, as well as the wide variations in national resources. He doubted that American librarians could expect to be satisfied with the world's average bibliographical effort as it might be reflected by UNESCO, and suspected that additional programs beyond anything that comes out of that organization will be required to satisfy American research needs.

Subject Bibliography

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

The information contained in a publication is usually more important to a scholar than the name of its author. There are, therefore, good reasons for believing that the varieties of bibliography to be considered here may be even more important than the author or main-entry compilations treated in the first memorandum, and it might be supposed that subject bibliography would prove to be the more extensively developed of the two species.

In fact, however, national bibliographies, printed library catalogues, and union catalogues, place at the scholar's disposal, in convenient form and in relatively few alphabets, millions of titles of books, all arranged by author. It is more difficult to discover among this same collection of titles the works that deal with any one subject. National bibliographies in many cases have subject indexes or arrangements of some sort; there were twenty subject union catalogues in the United States by 1940;⁷³ and the demand for subject lists of periodicals⁷⁴ has been met to some extent. Proposals for an American national subject union catalogue,⁷⁵ however, are still proposals, and the *Union List of Serials* has no subject index as yet.

Library catalogues and national bibliographies began when separate books were the normal form of publication. With few exceptions they have continued to register volumes and pamphlets only, though it is now recognized that in many fields the contents of serials are more important than the monographs.

If the serial had never been invented or had never been used for publication of scholarly articles, libraries would have faced a problem

of growth—not in physical bulk, but in the number of units to be handled—much more serious than the doubling every twenty years that has occurred. It seems probable that the flood of research pamphlets would have forced them to adopt some system of cooperative bibliography and cataloguing.

If, on the other hand, all serious publication had been taken over by the serial, libraries would have had to abandon their classified systems of shelving and, unless they were content with rigorously selective cataloguing and subject heading, would have had to depend entirely on printed bibliographies for both author and subject indexing of their collections.

It could be argued that either of the possibilities mentioned would have proved preferable to the present situation, which might be described as a compromise between the monograph and the serial that helps libraries to delude themselves. Great dictionary catalogues and closely classified stack collections seem much less attractive when one reflects that the single alphabet does not tell anything about the contents of serials and the classification does not bring those contents into a logical place on the shelves.⁷⁶

Despite the importance of library classification and cataloguing, it may be said that the major problem of subject bibliography is the problem of indexing and abstracting serials. It is easier to locate serials by means of union lists than to locate books through union catalogues; but the bibliography of serial contents is of a magnitude to dwarf the problem of monograph bibliography. Frauendorfer estimates that there are from ten to fifteen million articles per year.⁷⁷ Bradford has estimated that, in science and technology alone (not including medicine), 750,000 articles evaluated as “good or very fair” appear annually in 15,000 periodicals. A study in electrical engineering indicated that 400 journals in that field produce 25,000 articles annually, of which half are “good or fair,” while general serials and those in related subjects double the figure.⁷⁸ Harding quotes an estimate of 33,000 scientific periodicals and points out that the *Index-Catalogue* of the Army Medical Library lists 2,500,000 books and articles on medicine during the past sixty years, appearing in 7,000 journals.⁷⁹ In endocrinology alone, Mrs. Cowles has estimated that 1,300 journals should be examined in order to keep up with progress in the subject.⁸⁰

Indexing and abstracting services have also been multiplying. Bradford estimates that there are 40,000,000 entries in bibliographies shelved in the Science Library.⁸¹ About 46,000 references to electrical engineering are yielded annually by eleven indexing and abstracting journals on the subject, plus eleven more in broader fields. The difficulty is that duplication reduces the number of articles actually indexed to nine or ten thousand, or only about one-third of the "good or fair" articles that are published. Bradford estimates that this proportion holds good for science as a whole.⁸²

Indexing services, numbering only twenty in 1893,⁸³ have increased until in 1939 an ALA committee could tabulate 404 currently issued.⁸⁴ Moreover, a great many journals devote a considerable portion of their space to bibliographical summaries and lists; in spite of 22 general medical services and 45 more in 28 related fields, it was found that 154 medical journals on the shelves of one library contained bibliographical sections.⁸⁵ Another survey showed that seven history periodicals gave from 38 to 62 per cent of their space to documentation—a great portion of this merely to title lists.⁸⁶ There can be little doubt that duplication, incompleteness, slowness, inadequate or loose selection, and excessive costs are to be found in the indexing and abstracting of most subjects.⁸⁷

Some observers, appalled by the quantity of publication, have demanded rigorous control or curtailment. Harding notes that a curve representing quantity of research publication closely follows the curve of stock market prices.⁸⁸ There have been proposals that only an approved list of serials be abstracted, with material appearing in the rest to be regarded as ephemeral.⁸⁹ But there seems to be little prospect of reduction in the quantity of publication. Selectivity in indexing and, particularly, in abstracting, is a different matter, but the scholar who uses indexes wants information regardless of whether or not it appears in an "approved" journal. It seems reasonable to argue, therefore, that any selection should be made only after as complete an examination of the literature as possible.

The needs have always been obvious. In nearly every field there is a place for three kinds of service—inclusive indexes, more selective abstracts, and periodical (usually annual) summaries of progress.⁹⁰ If an indexing or abstracting service covers a broad field, it ought to be divisible into smaller subject sections to which individuals can

subscribe.⁹¹ It should be international in coverage and prompt in appearance,⁹² and should index a subject, not a list of serials.⁹³

Before considering the comprehensive, full-scale attacks on the problem that have been suggested or attempted, it may be worth while to note a few of the less ambitious proposals that may offer means of improving the present situation to some extent. Bibliographies of bibliography are one such method, and the *Index Bibliographicus* may be described as one of the most successful undertakings of the IIC.⁹⁴ There have been various proposals for library specialization and collaboration in indexing. Poole's *Index*, of course, is in part the result of an effort of this sort, and in 1877 one librarian thought that, if libraries would collaborate on a universal subject index, "the labour imposed on each would be trifling."⁹⁵ The ALI plan called for cooperative analytics.⁹⁶ More recently a central office to collect unpublished library bibliographies has been proposed.⁹⁷ It has also been suggested that the subject analytics of the New York Public Library catalogue be published.

Preparation of abstracts by the author of each article has been advocated since 1895 at least, when a Harvard committee, replying to the Royal Society inquiry, proposed that publishers of journals issue for each article cards containing an eight- to ten-line abstract by the author.⁹⁸ Author abstracts were officially recommended by the Subcommittee on Bibliography of the IIC.⁹⁹ Efforts have also been made toward standardization of abstracts and of bibliographical notices.¹⁰⁰

A report on standardization of bibliographical abbreviations was made at the Rome conference,¹⁰¹ and a resolution was adopted calling for action in collaboration with the IIC.¹⁰² A code for abbreviation of serial titles was published in 1930.¹⁰³ Standardization of the format of serials has been repeatedly urged since 1909,¹⁰⁴ and ASLIB,¹⁰⁵ IIC,¹⁰⁶ IID,¹⁰⁷ and the American Standards Association have all made recommendations, the latter at the request of a joint committee of American library associations.¹⁰⁸

It has been hoped from time to time that new mechanical or technical developments would help to solve the bibliographical problem. Jewett's stereotype plates gave way to addressograph plates advocated in 1924,¹⁰⁹ and the Adrema-Machine, which mechanically sorted such plates and printed entries from them, attracted some attention.¹¹⁰ Photographic reproduction of cards¹¹¹ now seems to have made it

unnecessary to store and sort plates, and automatic sorting devices present very interesting possibilities. It must be remembered, however, that articles must be abstracted and cards must be prepared before these machines can begin their operations.

Rider's microcard proposal,¹¹² or some variation on it such as microbibliography,¹¹³ might revolutionize library methods,¹¹⁴ but it does not seem probable that new methods will materially affect the problem of current bibliography during the immediate future. However, potential developments ought to be kept in mind as well as the possibility that new techniques will increase the quantity of material that must be handled.

Adoption of a uniform system of classification, while often urged in connection with plans for a universal bibliography, has also been the most persistently advocated method for coordinating and making the most of present indexing and abstracting services. It has been pointed out that such a classification would serve as an international bibliographical language.¹¹⁵ Enthusiasm for the decimal classification as a tool of this sort seems to have been largely responsible for the calling of the Brussels conference of 1895 and the establishment of IIB by Messrs. Otlet and LaFontaine.¹¹⁶ Use of the UDC in all published catalogues was urged at the International Publishers Conference of 1896¹¹⁷ and was approved by resolution at Rome in 1929.¹¹⁸ Since the development of IIB into a federation, FID, advocacy of the classification has been a major activity of national affiliated societies.¹¹⁹

It was asserted, as long ago as 1877,¹²⁰ that more bibliographical work was being done piecemeal than would be necessary, if properly coordinated, to produce a universal index. Bradford's studies have indicated a similar conclusion.¹²¹ By clipping and filing entries from all services that use the UDC (estimated to comprise about one-third of all abstracts issued), the Science Library in London has been able to clip from 120,000 to 150,000 entries per year and by 1939 had assembled a file of more than 2,000,000.¹²² More widespread adoption of the classification, especially if combined with a reduction in duplication, would make it possible to accumulate much larger files.¹²³

The UDC has not, however, had clear sailing. At the outset it was rejected by the *International Catalogue of Scientific Literature*. It has been abandoned by some institutions that attempted to use it, notably the International Institute of Agriculture,¹²⁴ though there are

differences of opinion as to the wisdom of such decisions and as to the quality of the results achieved with classifications substituted for UDC. Uniformity has not always been maintained in its application, and it has frequently been "nationalized."¹²⁵ Finally, it has always had its foes as well as its ardent supporters, and it seems unlikely that either party will soon disappear from the scene.

Schneider, arguing that it is impossible to work out a classification satisfactory to all nations, adds that "The old prejudice against the Dewey classification scheme will always reassert itself. The artificial bibliographical language breaks down into dialects that differ ever increasingly from each other." He concedes that "There are fields in which national differences are negligible."¹²⁶ Perhaps, however, the differences between specialists in various subjects are more justifiable and no less irreconcilable than those between nations. A universal scheme implies a single viewpoint and one logical place for each item, but it seems very doubtful that a publication of interest, for example, to experts in agriculture, chemistry, and biology can be classified from the viewpoints of all three groups at once. In such a case, duplication in indexing and lack of uniformity in subject classifications may be preferable to concealing material from two of the three specialists who need to use it.

The desirability of coordinating services by some means has always been evident. Subjects are not national in their scope, so any national system is at a disadvantage. There may be better hopes of success for specialized bibliographies,¹²⁷ but it is never possible to pick out a list of journals that can be relied on to contain all the material on a subject, so any subject bibliography needs the help either of a clearing-house or of organizations in related fields to pass on to it material from serials for which it does not subscribe.¹²⁸ Some proposals for national and subject coordination and control¹²⁹ or for central bibliographical offices¹³⁰ are too vague to classify, but, in general, plans that do not call for a world library attack the problem from either the national or the subject side.

There are, of course, many national indexes,¹³¹ and there have always been proposals for issuing them in a form that would facilitate their integration.¹³² A national library might collect all serials to be indexed or abstracted and hold them as a reference collection for the use of such services,¹³³ but it has more often been urged that a national

agency do the work of indexing itself.¹³⁴ A good deal has been accomplished in some countries along this line.¹³⁵

In the United States there were proposals for current abstracting by the WPA,¹³⁶ and Ellsworth's centralized cataloguing scheme calls for two subject bibliography services in each of thirty-eight fields. The fields were not defined, but the subscription price for each service was set at fifteen dollars per year.¹³⁷ The final recommendation of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Indexing and Abstracting was that, through the research councils and library associations, a general indexing and abstracting program be set up, preferably at the Library of Congress and with government support.¹³⁸ In connection with national plans, it may also be observed that a joint Anglo-American central service has been suggested.¹³⁹

The best-known example of an international index dependent on national centres was the *International Catalogue of Scientific Literature*, which was begun at the end of the nineteenth century and survived until the first world war.¹⁴⁰ Materials for this catalogue were gathered, in large part, by national bureaux (some of which published their own contributions currently),¹⁴¹ and it was sometimes criticized for having a national instead of a subject basis, since the system required many subject specialists in each bureau.¹⁴² It was also, of course, criticized by proponents of the UDC, and it proved to be much less prompt in appearance than had been hoped.

National efforts at coordination have, it appears, often been prompted by the existence of national libraries and national bibliographies of books. There are also, however, a great many international organizations in subject fields—so many that the Rome conference noted the need for a list of organizations concerned with international bibliography¹⁴³—and these have usually been the basis of plans calling for a “vertical” or subject approach to the problem. A number of these subject organizations have attempted to promote bibliographical coordination in their own fields. The International Institute of Agriculture, for example, published in 1937 an *Aperçu des Bibliographies Courantes Concernant l'Agriculture et les Sciences Connexes* and recommended international abstracting services plus a world bibliography based on more inclusive national lists.¹⁴⁴ Plans for centralization of chemical documentation were suggested in 1912, and in 1932 the Office International de Chimie was organized. It

published a *Répertoire International des Centres de Documentation Chimique* in 1935 and encouraged establishment of national centres.¹⁴⁵ Plans for coordination in economics were made by a committee of the IIIC in 1925.¹⁴⁶ The same organization also considered educational bibliography.¹⁴⁷ The International Committee of Historical Sciences, founded in 1926 and representing forty nations, was responsible for several bibliographical series,¹⁴⁸ and the Institut International de Collaboration Philosophique occupied itself with bibliography of bibliography and the listing of work in progress.¹⁴⁹

Several subject organizations have also maintained international libraries, and the Rome conference recommended that such organizations become bibliographical centres for their fields and publish international bibliographies of current literature.¹⁵⁰ The library of the International Institute of Agriculture began a *Répertoire Universel de Bibliographie Agricole* which was not published,¹⁵¹ but the U.S. Department of Agriculture Library, receiving thirteen thousand serials annually, now issues a *Bibliography of Agriculture* covering all literature received and running to fifty thousand items per year.¹⁵² Another United States government bibliographical enterprise of international magnitude is the *Index-Catalogue* of the Army Medical Library, which has been said to contain more than 80 per cent of the literature of the subject.¹⁵³ Establishment of a comprehensive current indexing and abstracting service in the same field has been advocated.¹⁵⁴ Publishers of card abstract bibliographies have included the Maison de la Chimie and the *Engineering Index*, Inc.,¹⁵⁵ and the Concilium Bibliographicum of Zurich is, of course, the best-known pioneer in card bibliography publication.¹⁵⁶ Some international organizations, including the International Committee of Historical Sciences¹⁵⁷ and the Bureau Météorologique International,¹⁵⁸ have preferred to recommend that each nation maintain its own bureau and issue its own bibliography. It has also been proposed that national centres for the literature of librarianship and documentation be established to pass materials on to a world centre under the auspices of the FID, IIIC, and IFLA.¹⁵⁹ In 1927 a Committee of Experts in Biology recommended that separates be supplied by journals to each recognized indexing and abstracting service, that an international organization receive and distribute separates, that bibliographies exchange proof sheets, and that bibliographical sections of

periodicals be sold separately.¹⁶⁰

Because a subject bibliography restricted to publications of a single nation is unsatisfactory, and because any enterprise in a single subject must duplicate efforts in related areas and overlook some of the material scattered in other fields, it has always seemed to some observers that a universal bibliography and universal library must be established. This, of course, was the original plan of the IIB,¹⁶¹ and there were proposals, after the first world war, that the Brussels catalogue be copied for—or brought to—America.¹⁶² The IIIC entered into relations with the IIB,¹⁶³ and the Prague conference called for support of the universal bibliography.¹⁶⁴ Proposals for a world central library came before the UNESCO Preparatory Commission.¹⁶⁵

As it became apparent, after the first years of the IIB, that a true world library would not soon materialize, repeated suggestions were made for coordination of national author bibliography with world subject bibliography.¹⁶⁶ Most nations have a national library and national author bibliography of some sort; and most subjects have international organizations and bibliographies that make some attempt to extend beyond national boundaries. Some subjects, as noted, have international libraries. Coordination of the two systems would produce the universal network advocated by Otlet,¹⁶⁷ Gerard,¹⁶⁸ Bonnet,¹⁶⁹ Ansteinsson,¹⁷⁰ Donker Duyvis,¹⁷¹ and others.

Such a network requires at least some kind of international coordinating agency. The IIB hoped to be an international bibliographical union supported by the governments of the world.¹⁷² Its successor, the FID, is still considering means of coordination¹⁷³ as well as the standardization problems mentioned earlier in this memorandum. There have been proposals for an American bibliographical institute¹⁷⁴ or planning board.¹⁷⁵ The IFLA, the Office Central des Institutions Internationales,¹⁷⁶ and the Union Académique Internationale¹⁷⁷ (of which the ACLS is the American organism) are among the agencies that must be involved in efforts at coordination. Mrs. Cowles' plan, as noted, called for joint action by a number of American societies.¹⁷⁸ Even more recently suggestions have been made for reorganization of the ADI to serve as the American agency of FID, and the Library of Congress has announced plans for establishment of an office to study the bibliographical problem and to collaborate with existing agencies.

A number of observers, including David,¹⁷⁹ Evans,¹⁸⁰ and White,¹⁸¹ have hoped that UNESCO may prove to be an answer to the need. It has been emphasized that the question is particularly urgent now because of the extensive development—approaching a monopoly—of bibliographical services by pre-1939 Germany.

The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization declared that “the fundamental requisite for adequate use of the world’s knowledge which appears in documentary form is a list of all publications whether printed, mimeographed or reproduced otherwise, which are issued in all countries of the world . . . whether they are available in the book trade, whether they are published by governments or their sub-divisions, or by trade associations, scholarly groups, or . . . other sources.”¹⁸² The Counsellor for Libraries and Museums of the UNESCO Preparatory Commission suggested that each nation produce its own complete national classified bibliography and encourage special bibliographies, union catalogues, surveys, abstracts, and indexes. A world bibliographical and library centre to coordinate and assist the work of the national central libraries was also proposed, with particular emphasis on the abstracting problem.¹⁸³

The world coordinating centre (but not the world library centre) was endorsed by the Cultural Institutions Round Table of the American National Commission,¹⁸⁴ with the stipulation that it should stimulate—but not produce—bibliographical work. The Preparatory Commission has officially recommended “establishment of international central bibliographical services and promotion of necessary bibliographical enterprises in cooperation with national central libraries.”¹⁸⁵

There seems to be justification for believing that, unless UNESCO devotes itself entirely to “mass media,” it must give some attention to bibliography. One of the authors of this memorandum has suggested that UNESCO sponsor a system of world subject libraries (to be established in connection with strong collections already in existence) and world subject bibliographies. If, for example, the Army Medical Library were to become the world medical library, it would attempt to acquire and promptly index in a world medical bibliography each new publication on the subject. It would pass on to other world subject libraries microfilm copies of all articles in their fields that appear in serials they were not receiving, and would be supplied by

them with copies of medical items from journals not on its own list. Member nations of UNESCO would agree to acquire one copy of each new publication and, through their national libraries, to pass it on to the appropriate world subject library. Financing by UNESCO might be desirable to insure international control and coordination. The fact that most nations would wish to have their national libraries designated as world subject libraries for national history and literature would give UNESCO an opportunity to stimulate national libraries and national bibliography and would enable smaller nations to profit from the system and actively participate in it. National and international scholarly organizations in subject fields would be involved, at least in an advisory capacity. Though the system might well begin with publication of indexes only, world subject libraries would naturally become centres for abstracting services in their fields.

A plan of this sort may be described as a logical development of many of the recommendations that have been cited. If it seems desirable, many problems, including classification, financing, retrospective bibliography, and selectivity, remain to be considered in connection with it. If it seems too ambitious, impracticable, or undesirable, what should be done—in the United States and internationally? Can a start be made, either in this country or in a few subject fields, before UNESCO acts? Are further studies necessary before any action is taken?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Shaw supplemented the Preliminary Memorandum by reporting that Vannevar Bush has built a machine that can make a thousand selections per second, or sixty thousand per minute, as compared with the four hundred per minute possible with punched cards. Another machine, patented in 1938, works on somewhat different principles but operates at about the same speed as Bush's.

With regard to the major problem of subject indexing and abstracting, Mr. Shaw believed that encouragement of comprehensive listing would automatically strengthen the abstracting services, since the existence of good lists would enable the abstracting journals to concentrate on the job which only scholars can do—the selection of important articles. Scholars are also needed for reviewing and for sum-

marizing progress, while listing can be done almost mechanically at low cost. Before beginning the Department of Agriculture's bibliography, Mr. Shaw had tried to make sure that it would not harm *Biological Abstracts*, *Chemical Abstracts*, and similar publications and had found general agreement that the new list would, instead, be helpful to services of this kind.

Mr. Flynn agreed. He also reported that some scholars have called for an abstracting journal for biology so complete that a man who has consulted it for a particular subject can be sure he has found everything published during the period covered by the list. But no such service exists for any subject, with the possible exception of chemistry.

Selectivity is extremely difficult. Much of the significant progress is in unexplored fields, and a comparatively minor paper may contain a lead far more important to the advancement of science than a very much more pretentious monograph. The articles that become subjects of correspondence are often papers, Mr. Flynn added, that he, as an editor, would not have regarded as at all important.

He estimated that the biological field is served by some six thousand serials, most of which have not been available in this country since the outbreak of the war. It is not known how many more items there are that never reach this country. *Biological Abstracts*, after twenty years, is now covering from twenty-two to twenty-three hundred series, perhaps 40 per cent of the known literature of the field. Funds are not available for complete coverage, which would call for budgets in the neighborhood of \$250,000 annually at present costs. *Chemical Abstracts* operates on an annual budget of about \$200,000.

In reply to a question, Mr. Flynn stated that the German series had covered Central Europe and Russia better than any American publication has done. *Biological Abstracts* is attempting to become more inclusive, and has been locating scholars in Europe who are ready to abstract journals to which they have access.

Since January 1, arrangements had been made for abstracting six hundred additional periodicals in this way. But, even assuming that the present rate of expansion could be maintained, this would mean that ten years must elapse before completion could be approached.

Mr. Brown believed that indexes, abstracts, and annual summaries of progress are needed in nearly all fields and emphasized the difficulties caused by suspension of the German abstracting journals. Mr. Shaw added that about 26 per cent of the total number of chemical articles to be found in all indexing and abstracting journals had been listed only in the German publications. With reference to Mr. Flynn's remarks, he pointed out that the practice of having abstracts prepared abroad means that the attention of scholars is often drawn to material not available anywhere in this country.

Mr. Vosper emphasized the need for abstracting in the social sciences, and Mr. Boyd agreed, adding that it will probably be more difficult to get funds to support abstracting in the social sciences and humanities than in science, because, in the latter field, it is easier to demonstrate the practical and financially profitable results of such work. The question of finances, he remarked, arises at every point in this discussion, but it may be that more is being spent in duplicative efforts than would be needed for a comprehensive job if there were adequate coordination. A great deal of work is being done by industry; the Bell Telephone Company, for example, supplies every research man on its staff with comprehensive analyses of all scientific literature that might affect his work.

Mr. Brown recalled the case of the poultry industry and Chicago stockyards which had proposed to grant \$100,000 for certain research. Thanks to the abstracting services, it was discovered that the information wanted was already available at a cost of ten dollars. Mr. Evans hoped that savings could be discovered which would be utilizable for further coverage.

Mr. White called attention to the investment represented by subject cataloguing in libraries and wondered what could be done through published library catalogues to eliminate the necessity for this duplication of costs.

Mr. Fleming suggested that, while the need for social science indexing and abstracting is evident, attention should first be concentrated on science, where much more has been done already. A satisfactory bibliographical pattern for science might serve as a guide to planning for the social sciences and humanities. He proposed that the conference recommend that abstracts prepared by their authors accompany all published articles. General adoption of this

system would make it possible to deposit abstracts at national centres from which abstracting services could issue lists.

Mr. Young said that perhaps the most expensive failure of the Social Science Research Council had been its four-year attempt to abstract material in the social fields. At the end of the four years, research men in all the subjects involved had been carefully interviewed, and it had been found that the abstracts were not being used. Among the reasons for this failure was the absence of—and difficulty of—sufficient selectivity. Probably too large an area was being covered. At any rate, the service was discontinued because it had been impossible to obtain a sufficient subsidy to go on when it could not be proved that the result was of great value for research purposes. A report of the experience is on file.

Mr. Brown said he had never understood the report because he knew how much the publication had been used in his own library. One major complaint of the specialists, Mr. Young replied, had been that the abstracts came out too late. Another difficulty was that abstracts in the social sciences if they are to be sufficiently informative cannot be boiled down so much as in a subject like chemistry. The service, consequently, had been chiefly useful as a finding list. Another point of difference between the natural and social sciences is that a greater proportion of the natural science contributions come out as articles, while books are relatively much more important in the social sciences. In spite of all criticisms, however, Mr. Young noted that, when publication was suspended, there was a sufficient demand to absorb quickly the several hundred sets that had been left on hand.

Mr. Downs wondered if in the social sciences an index would not be as satisfactory for most purposes as an abstracting journal. Mr. Young believed that it might be, perhaps with the inclusion of some annotations to indicate the nature of the contents better than would be done by titles alone.

Mr. Heindel had been considering, with reference to bibliography, what private groups and both national and international agencies might do quickly and at relatively low cost. He suggested that selective lists might be tied in with surveys of progress in each field. Such annual summaries, he thought, were badly needed, and librarians might encourage scholars to prepare them by first producing the

evaluative bibliographies from which they could be made. Foreign distribution of the results would represent a valuable contribution to international cultural relations. The American Council of Learned Societies, he added, is preparing a summary of research in the humanities during the past four years.

Mr. Peiss pointed out that the Germans used to prepare most of the annual summaries, and the United States now has an opportunity to fill the gap. Mr. Heindel also thought that this country could do the job without undue chauvinism. If a real attempt were made, this might prove to be the greatest contribution possible within a period of six months or a year.

In view of recent pronouncements by national leaders in wartime research, Mr. White wondered what the possibilities of governmental subsidies might be. There should be some legitimate means of securing government aid for bibliographical activity. It might be done by means of an appropriation to UNESCO. Mr. Brown added that, as compared with the cost of research in this country, the amount spent to avoid bibliographical duplication is infinitesimal, and, in view of the costs of duplicating research, better bibliography represents a financial saving.

Mr. Milczewski pointed out that the government does a good deal already through the Department of Agriculture bibliography, for example, and Library of Congress activities. Mr. Evans believed that a statement of policy on the part of the government could not be obtained until the total problem had been defined; a comprehensive summary of bibliographical needs might be one of the accomplishments of this conference.

Mr. Vosper reported that his colleagues at California had recommended preparation and publication of two related tools—a world list of periodicals, giving the usual bibliographical information for each as well as an indication of whether or not it is abstracted, and a world list of indexing and abstracting journals, giving a list of the publications covered by each. This was proposed as a first step toward extension of indexing and abstracting and reduction of duplication.

Mr. Heindel repeated his belief that summaries of progress are the greatest immediate need. Such summaries, he thought, should be prepared by professional associations rather than by the government.

Mr. Evans thought that the subject would be clarified if problems

of comprehensive coverage and of evaluation were separated and if the distinction between retrospective and current works in both fields were kept in mind. For retrospective bibliography, he believed that Mr. White's suggestion on library subject catalogues was very significant. A remarkable number of uses have developed for the Library of Congress printed cards in book form, even without any subject control. Library catalogues, of course, will not solve the periodical problem.

For evaluation, *The United States Quarterly Book List* covers part of the field, not including serial material, and may contribute to surveys of scholarly progress. But the problem of evaluation ought to be discussed after general conclusions were reached on the comprehensive problem.

A major question in connection with the latter is whether each nation is to do part of the work or this country is to do it all. Up to now in this country there has been an attempt to cover the world with America's samples of the world's production.

Mr. Flynn, referring to Mr. Boyd's comments on costs, said he felt sure that a complete abstracting of the world's literature could be provided at perhaps half the sum now wasted through needless duplication and insufficient use of existing facilities. In response to a question, he expressed the opinion that coordination would have to be voluntary, and explained that for several years discussions have been in progress between British and American abstracting services, looking toward an immediate exchange of abstracts procured and toward ultimate amalgamation of *Biological Abstracts* and the British journals. It has been hoped that eventually other nations will also be brought into the plan.

Last spring, two French biologists came to this country with proposals for a comprehensive international abstracting service in the biological sciences to be created and housed at Geneva and financed, in its early stages, by an American foundation. They had believed that *Biological Abstracts*, if broadened, might serve as the nucleus of such an organization. During the past week, Mr. Flynn added, a proposal of this sort had been discussed with a Russian representative, who indicated that the Russians believe an internationally managed service for biology would be feasible, and who reported that Russia has no plans for a service of its own but would be willing to

cooperate with *Biological Abstracts* if assured that the publication were truly international.

Mr. Brown reported on cooperation in the social sciences and in genetics, but Mr. Shaw called attention to the fact that both the British and the Dutch are starting medical abstracting journals at present, both covering the same fields and both publishing their abstracts in English.

Mr. Fleming reported that there is now cooperation in physiology and in chemistry. The American *Chemical Abstracts* uses abstracts prepared by British scholars. He hoped that the system might be expanded, perhaps through agreement by international congresses, and that scholars might agree to support a single service in each of the various fields. Mr. Evans wondered if the Russians would accept Mr. Fleming's view that English is now the major language of science. Mr. Fleming replied that he was sure they would. Only a week before the point had been taken up with the secretary of the Medical Section of the Russian Academy of Sciences, who had expressed himself as entirely satisfied with an abstracting service published in English, provided only that it were not nationalistic and that it could be made sufficiently inclusive to meet Russian needs.

If the Russians abstract their own literature for an international publication, Mr. Evans asked if they would supply abstracts in English or if their abstracts would have to be translated. Mr. Flynn believed that arrangements could be made to have the original abstracts written in English.

Mr. Evans believed that the projects reported by Messrs. Flynn and Fleming demanded extensive exploration. It is of vital importance, he said, to decide either that abstracting is to be done at a central point for each subject or that abstracts are to be made throughout the world and then sent in to a centre for publication. The matter may also involve the Farmington plan for acquisitions. Would American libraries be willing to have the abstracts and to get copies of the originals by microfilm, or do they want to have all the material brought to this country?

Mr. White suggested that there might be no decisive objection to publishing abstracts in the language of the original article. *Biological Abstracts*, Mr. Flynn replied, has for years been developing in a cooperative direction, the ideal being to have the entire Dutch

literature, for example, abstracted in the Netherlands by scholars capable of furnishing abstracts in English or of getting their abstracts translated into English. The important thing is to get everything listed in a single index. ,

In reply to a question on cooperation with closely related and overlapping fields, he said that permission has been given to twenty-five abstracting journals in such areas to reproduce anything they need from *Biological Abstracts*. Such agreements are always reciprocal.

Mr. Evans suggested that this meant increased duplication. In reply to Mr. Flynn's explanation that it results in far better focusing through indexes of the information needed by different groups, Mr. Evans thought that, in a well-organized total scheme, it could still be described as needless duplication. Mr. Flynn replied that this was a viewpoint of librarians rather than of research biologists. Mr. Shaw agreed, stating that, while duplication ought to be avoided, it is not yet possible to say how much of it is necessary. He offered an example in the field of research on gas generators for use in gas plants. There are hundreds of articles on gas generators listed in the general indexing and abstracting services, and it would be necessary to examine each item to determine whether or not it applies to gas plants; but the *Journal* of the Society of Gas Industries lists only the articles that apply to that field—two during the past two years. The separate index is not unnecessary duplication from the point of view of the man in the gas business. Moreover, an article can be abstracted from four or five different points of view for different uses.

Mr. Boyd added that a master plan for bibliographical coverage does not mean a single bibliographical tool. He pointed out also that the amount of duplication in *Biological Abstracts*, which is a shining example of cooperation, is infinitely less than in the bibliographical work done by librarians.

Interlibrary Loan

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

The term 'co-operation' is used in general to describe efforts made by librarians to organize the lending of books from one library to another. . . . The main object of the work is to enable any librarian to obtain any book required. But the establishment of such a system will probably lead to other results of far-reaching importance. It will bring to light and make accessible a great amount of bibliographical information. . . . It may actually lead to a mutually advantageous redistribution of stock among libraries, by exchange, and the pooling of little used books in central dépôts. It may help to rationalize the acquisition of books and prevent unnecessary duplication. . . . It . . . seems to be a first and necessary step in a much needed organization of the bibliographical world.¹⁸⁶

The foregoing quotation shows that interlibrary loan is regarded by the author of a very useful volume on *Library Co-operation in Europe* as the foundation of efforts at cooperation. One might argue with Pafford's approach, pointing out that bibliographical enterprises, exchanges of printed materials and of personnel, and other cooperative activities are possible in the absence of interlibrary loan. In particular, it can be asserted that photographic reproduction (to be treated in the next memorandum) may be an acceptable substitute for lending—and sometimes a preferable alternative. It would hardly be fair to say that institutions such as the British Museum and the Reference Department of the New York Public Library, which cannot lend books, have never engaged in library cooperation. Coordinated acquisitions programs, at least for the libraries of a single metropolis, are also possible without lending. Finally, if loans are a stimulus to

specialization—and Pafford observes that “in these countries, and particularly where inter-lending has long been organized, a tendency for libraries to specialize has resulted”¹⁸⁷—it can be added that cause and effect are not entirely distinct, for specialization inevitably helps to increase the number of loans.

Practically, however, interlibrary loan has been the cornerstone of cooperative programs. It has not, historically, always preceded bibliography and exchange—though interlibrary loans were known in the eighth century,¹⁸⁸ and though Goethe made them when he was a librarian¹⁸⁹—but projects in the bibliographical and exchange fields, even when relatively successful, have often led to nothing more, while extensive development of loan seems almost always to be followed by the inauguration of a number of the other forms of cooperation mentioned by Pafford.

Jewett had hoped that his plan for stereotyping catalogue entries would lead to a union catalogue and to loan, copying, and information services.¹⁹⁰ But loans must have been very infrequent in this country before the establishment of the ALA, for a paper in the first volume of the *Library Journal*, pointing out that the practice was not unknown in Europe, even internationally, and that the Boston Public Library allowed nonresidents to borrow, suggested that American libraries begin to lend books to one another.¹⁹¹ Fifteen years later, the same author, in his address as President of the ALA, was able to speak of the generosity in lending that had been shown by the Army Medical Library, Harvard, and the Boston Athenaeum.¹⁹²

A governmental decree of 1883 regulated interlibrary loans in Austria, and similar regulations followed three years later in both Italy and France. In the latter country, university libraries were then first authorized to lend directly among themselves rather than through the Ministry of Public Instruction. Prussian decrees of 1890, 1893, and 1897 were issued on the subject.¹⁹³ Some of these early regulations specifically authorized international loans, which were one of the subjects of a paper read at Chicago in 1893 and published in both Germany and the United States.¹⁹⁴ A reciprocal agreement on direct loan was proposed by the Association Internationale des Académies in 1901.¹⁹⁵

Lending, both domestic and international, has been on the programs of most international organizations, including the IIB¹⁹⁶ and

IIIC.¹⁹⁷ It was, of course, involved in cooperative plans like the one formulated by the ALI,¹⁹⁸ as well as in recent ALA programs for relations with Latin America and other areas.¹⁹⁹ The American libraries abroad that have been financed by the Department of State have not neglected the practice.²⁰⁰ In 1926 the Prague congress called for reduction in the formalities involved in loans,²⁰¹ and resolutions adopted at Madrid in 1935 stated principles that were to be embodied in the international code, which will be considered later in this memorandum.²⁰² Encouragement of loans was also provided for in a number of bilateral agreements on intellectual relations, notably those concluded in 1935 between Italy and Austria,²⁰³ Italy and Hungary,²⁰⁴ and France and Austria.²⁰⁵

The CIB published occasional statistics on international loan,²⁰⁶ and Godet collected figures for 1934 from as many countries as possible. His compilation shows that Germany lent 5,359 items, or nearly as many as the next ten nations combined, and, with 1,250, was also the leading borrower, though Poland, Switzerland, Denmark, Austria, and some other neighbors of Germany were not far behind. The United States and Canada lent (chiefly to one another) and borrowed only about as much as Holland or Hungary.²⁰⁷

It is evident that only countries with well-developed domestic interlibrary lending systems can be expected to do very much internationally. The German system has been described by Pafford²⁰⁸ and others.²⁰⁹ The union catalogue²¹⁰ and the Auskunftsbureau established in connection with it at the Prussian State Library were, of course, major features. Prussian libraries had interlending relations with 478 foreign libraries in 31 countries in 1934, and the total for interlibrary loans both domestic and foreign reached 450,000 in 1932, when the State Library in Berlin lent 84,713 items itself.²¹¹

Interlibrary loan could be discussed as a relatively novel idea in England as late as 1917,²¹² and the German system seems to have been the inspiration for attempts by the Association of University Teachers, starting in 1923, to develop cooperation.²¹³ An Enquiry Office, established by this group in 1925 with the help of a grant from the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, handled a few hundred requests per year until its transfer in 1931 to the National Central Library.²¹⁴ The latter institution and its regional bureaux have grown in importance steadily since their beginnings in 1916²¹⁵ but may still

be described as primarily more a popular than a scholarly library system.

A small volume published in 1928 was devoted to articles, chiefly by American librarians, on interlibrary loan,²¹⁶ but the first important study of international loans as an American activity appears to be Bishop's report of 1931.²¹⁷ Lending to Canadian libraries had, of course, always been taken for granted and was hardly considered an international activity, but loan relations with other countries had been infrequent. It may safely be predicted that the relative isolation of American libraries in this respect will rapidly disappear because of the acceleration of world-wide transportation, the development of research in Latin American institutions, the continued growth in bibliographical resources of the United States, and the increasing number of foreign scholars who are becoming familiar at first hand with library collections in this country.

One curiosity in the early development of international loans was the practice of sending material via diplomatic channels. Inconvenience and delay often resulted from this method,²¹⁸ and direct transmission of books from library to library was recommended at an early date.²¹⁹ The IIB²²⁰ and IIIC²²¹ have concurred, as well as the Rome conference, the latter in spite of a plea by Roland-Marcel for continued use of the diplomatic route for rare books.²²² Most observers seem to have felt that the only advantage of the old method was that it avoided payment of postage.²²³ Recommendation of direct transmission does not, of course, mean that national centres or clearinghouses for requests are unnecessary.

Though there has always been fairly general agreement on most of the principles involved, the need for formulation of them in a code of practice has been evident. An ALA committee prepared such a code for use in this country in 1917,²²⁴ and an ACRL committee published a revised version in 1940.²²⁵ Internationally, loan regulations were summarized in 1929 by a committee of the IIIC²²⁶ and were discussed at Rome.²²⁷ Further consideration at Madrid in 1935²²⁸ led to the adoption of an international code,²²⁹ which is illustrated with model forms for loan requests, information requests, acknowledgments, and package labels.

The code stipulates that its purpose is to secure books by the most rapid, most economical, and safest means. Individual libraries, na-

tional library associations, and national centres may adhere by notifying the IFLA of their readiness to grant complete reciprocity. The borrowing library is responsible for postage and insurance and for indemnification in case of loss or damage. Shipments are to be made by parcel post, with a special label, and a notification should accompany each consignment. The normal duration of loan is set at one month, not including time in transit. Each library is expected to make sure that the book wanted is not to be found in its own country before applying abroad, and works in great demand, extremely valuable books, and publications still in print and selling for less than two gold Swiss francs are not to be loaned. Shipments are to be made directly from library to library, and requests may be made either directly or through centres, with the lending library having the option of requiring that requests be transmitted to it through its national centre.

With regard to centres, the code recommends that an international loan centre in connection with a major library and, if possible, including an information bureau and union catalogue, be established in each country. The duty of such centres is to transmit requests to libraries in its country that can fulfill them, to make sure that books wanted by libraries of its own country are not to be found in the country before applying abroad, to keep statistics of international loans, and to supply the IFLA with an annual report on these as well as on photographic reproduction facilities available in its country.

A separate committee of the CIB studied legal questions involved in international loans and recommended that libraries be invited to agree to a system of arbitration in case of controversy.²³⁰

National centres were envisaged in the international code and the Library of Congress was designated in 1940 as the American clearing-house.²³¹ Centres of this sort have usually been recommended,²³² but they are not the only type of centre that has been proposed or established for loan purposes. In 1908 Lane proposed a separate central bureau of information and a loan collection for American college libraries, including storage warehouse facilities.²³³ American libraries abroad have served as bibliographical and loan centres to some extent.²³⁴ Likewise, the bilateral international cultural relations treaties that have been mentioned called for establishment of cultural insti-

tutes and provided that, if desired, loan requests could be transmitted through these institutes.²³⁵

There are, of course, many special, subject information centres,²³⁶ and interlibrary loans have been on the programs of such bodies as the International Institute of Agriculture.²³⁷ Another proposal has been that international exchange services act as loan clearinghouses.²³⁸ The Pan American Union has been recommended as a clearinghouse for this hemisphere,²³⁹ but it appears that the Hispanic Foundation at the Library of Congress has made greater progress toward development into such a centre.²⁴⁰

It was suggested in 1925 that the IIB become a world interlibrary loan clearinghouse.²⁴¹ There have been various efforts at the coordination of loan centres,²⁴² and, as a result of recommendations made by a committee of experts in 1929,²⁴³ a guide was published.²⁴⁴ National organizations, likewise, have attempted to coordinate and list documentation services within individual countries.²⁴⁵

The first step in developing a bibliographical information bureau and loan clearinghouse is, of course, to collect information on library resources in the region or nation it serves.²⁴⁶ One method of doing this is to make a survey of special collections. This has been done by such centres as the Bibliothèque Nationale²⁴⁷ and the Library of Congress.²⁴⁸

Establishment of a union catalogue is the next step, and its importance is demonstrated by the German interlibrary loan figures that have already been noted. The union lists of serials and union accessions lists issued in some countries are steps toward a further development, which had been begun in Germany on a more comprehensive scale with the printing of the *Gesamtkatalog*. Duplication of union catalogues will, of course, permit major borrowing libraries to make many of their loan requests directly and will relieve the national bibliographical centres of the necessity of searching many of the titles they must now handle.

Insufficient bibliographical information has undoubtedly been the major barrier to further growth of interlibrary loan, but it is not, especially at the international level, the only barrier. A number of the world's great libraries are not permitted to let books leave their premises, and the British, at least, who seem to be particularly disturbed at the prospect that a book may be out on loan when

requested,²⁴⁹ do not appear to regret this, but hope to be able to develop two comprehensive collections on each subject, one of which may be used for interlibrary loan while the other is maintained as a reference collection. For many subjects, they hope to establish still a third collection, to which open-shelf access may be permitted.²⁵⁰

The fact that interlibrary loan can become a considerable burden on large libraries has discouraged the practice to some extent²⁵¹ and has sometimes necessitated restrictions; but most libraries have shown their willingness to lend as freely as possible. Union catalogues, of course, are the best means of distributing the burden more evenly,²⁵² though specialization may also help in this direction.

Costs are a problem, and one survey has indicated that the expense of completing a loan is approximately \$3.50.²⁵³ The subject ought to be studied, but it should be kept in mind that many volumes are acquired by libraries to meet a single demand at a cost for purchase and processing higher than \$3.50, and that loans are normally requested only for books that cannot otherwise be obtained.²⁵⁴ The use of forms has been advocated as a means of reducing costs,²⁵⁵ and the German practice of charging a flat rate to the borrower regardless of the actual postage fee seems to have worked satisfactorily.²⁵⁶

Obviously there is no justification for levying import duties on international loans.²⁵⁷ Customs regulations have occasionally caused trouble, even between the United States and Canada, as Bishop has reported;²⁵⁸ and there should be international agreement on the abolition of needless formalities.²⁵⁹

The subject of postal rates on library materials in general is to be considered in a later memorandum, but it may be noted here that 50 per cent reductions in rates for interlibrary loans were recommended at the Rome conference.²⁶⁰ In Austria, as early as 1909, interlibrary loans were post free,²⁶¹ and, at later dates, they were reported to be free in Czechoslovakia,²⁶² Bulgaria,²⁶³ Russia,²⁶⁴ and Switzerland, where the national library association obtained the privilege in 1927 "on the ground of economy, claiming that such interlending would prevent the unnecessary purchase of books in the state and cantonal libraries and would therefore effect a saving in public funds."²⁶⁵ General adoption of this practice has been recommended by the IIB,²⁶⁶ the IIIC,²⁶⁷ and by several individuals in the United States.²⁶⁸

If UNESCO is to succeed in "initiating methods of international

cooperation calculated to give the people of all countries access to the printed and published materials produced by any of them," interlibrary loan will prove essential in its plans.

Prosecution of work on the union catalogue is one major contribution that the United States can make. Are there not others? Should international lending libraries of some kind be established on a regional or continental basis? Will it be enough, instead, to help existing libraries and encourage them to engage in interlibrary loan?

What can be done through American libraries abroad? The American Library in Paris has engaged in interlibrary loan on a fairly large scale. There are now American libraries, maintained by the Department of State, in most of the nations of the world. They are located in capitals and large cities. Might they not, through interlibrary loan, extend their services considerably? Could the policy be established that anyone who wants to read an American book shall be enabled to do so, either through his local library or by direct request to the American library in his country? Such a plan would require the collection of a central book stock, regional depôts to meet requests for popular books, and cooperation by the Library of Congress and other American research libraries to meet the scholarly demands that could be expected. Is it practicable? Should the United States be content with any contribution to international interlibrary lending that will not surpass the achievements of prewar Germany?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Metcalf recalled the conference in Washington two years before at which Mr. MacLeish had emphasized the importance of international interlibrary loans. In view of the present hazards of transportation, however, Mr. Downs doubted that extensive lending of original materials should be undertaken; he suggested that it might be preferable to look toward increasing use of microfilm and other photographic substitutes. The idea of loan, he added, is appealing and idealistic, but, practically, very considerable risks are run in the case of valuable materials.

Mr. White asked if there were not occasions when blocks of material might well be lent. If, for example, a group of Italians were working on a draft of a constitution and wished to use American

material, a collection of publications, not particularly valuable or irreplaceable, might be sent to them. Procedures of this sort might encourage specialization on a world-wide scale.

Mr. Heindel reported that interlibrary loans are a standard practice of the American overseas libraries, which may be in a position to help other institutions at present in areas where transportation is still difficult.

Photographic Reproduction

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

The photostat and a number of other devices for full-size reproduction of library materials are important, and it may be that new uses for them will develop. They do not, however, offer the great economies in production of extremely small editions and in storage space that are presented by microfilm; neither do they raise the problems involved in library handling of a medium that requires reading machines for its use. This memorandum, consequently, will be devoted almost entirely to microfilm and microprint. It should be added that technical details of new processes are beyond the competence of the authors and will not be treated.

Reproduction as a Substitute for Loan.—It hardly seems necessary to recount once more the story of the pigeons in 1870, or even to summarize the article by Goldschmidt and Otlet that brought microphotography to the attention of librarians in 1907.²⁶⁹ In retrospect, it appears that library applications of the new technique developed very slowly until the past few years, and it may also be asserted that, even now, the major function of microphotography is as a substitute for interlibrary loan. (This statement was contradicted by the discussion, page 50.) This use is, of course, implied by the place given to it in the international interlibrary loan code that was summarized in the previous memorandum,²⁷⁰ and, for the most part, this is also the place given to reproduction facilities as a feature of bibliographical centres in the programs of the IIIC²⁷¹ and of the FID and its national affiliates.²⁷² Such international subject organizations as the Office International de Chimie²⁷³ and the Institut International de Colla-

boration Philosophique²⁷⁴ have had similar interests, and copying as a substitute for loan was an activity of the ADI.²⁷⁵ The ALA has had a Committee on Photographic Reproduction since 1936, and, from 1938 to 1942, published the *Journal of Documentary Reproduction*, which was preceded by two annual volumes on *Microphotography for Libraries*.²⁷⁶

The chief reasons for turning to microfilm as a substitute for loan have been summarized by Fussler.²⁷⁷ It has been used for rare books, volumes that would be expensive to transport, items too often in use to be spared, parts of expensive sets, copies of only a few pages from a volume (particularly, of course, for articles from periodicals), reference copies that cannot be lent (including everything in the collections of some institutions), newspapers, and, in general, any material that cannot or should not be lent for one reason or another. It might be added that some items are too fragile to stand shipping and that, if a scholar wishes to be able to refer to a work over a considerable period of time, a reproduction is obviously preferable to a loan.

As in the case of loans, requests often come to a library that cannot meet them. One means of handling this situation without unnecessary delay is to exchange film orders. A committee headed by R. R. Shaw reported, on February 18, 1944, that eleven of the major libraries of the country had agreed to a plan of this kind, providing for a flat rate of fifty cents per periodical article on orders exchanged. The possibilities of extending the agreement to cover all types of photoduplication, of using a uniform order blank, and of establishing a uniform price scale for all types of copying were mentioned.²⁷⁸

It is evident that some method of coordination or listing is wanted in order to avoid unnecessary refilming. Lists of available manuscript reproductions were recommended by the IIC.²⁷⁹ The Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning, after an inquiry into microphotography made at the request of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, recommended in 1941 central listing of negatives, a master collection of negatives, an information centre on projects, and a list of microfilm services.²⁸⁰ During the following year the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center issued a *Union List of Microfilms*,²⁸¹ which has been followed by annual supplements. Establishment of a centre to handle requests for reproductions was recommended at a small informal

conference between the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the ALA International Relations Office, and representatives of the Department of State, in 1945.²⁸² The IIB had hoped to become a world clearinghouse for reproductions,²⁸³ and there have been similar proposals more recently, including one for establishment of such a clearinghouse by UNESCO.²⁸⁴

Inclusion of positive copies in a union list (as was done in the Philadelphia project) hardly seems necessary, for positives are not of an essentially different nature from original copies of books and might well be listed only in the national union catalogue. On the other hand, since negatives can be used for the production of additional copies, a union catalogue of negatives is highly desirable. It is not enough, however. Most libraries, when they receive a film order, do not wish to make and purchase a negative for themselves and do not think it proper to impose the cost of making both a negative and a positive on the individual or institution making the request. Consequently, they fill the order by supplying a negative. Even if this is purchased by a library or finds its way into one and is recorded in a union list, there is a considerable possibility that it will have been damaged in use sufficiently to make it unsatisfactory for further reproduction.

If a national centre such as the Library of Congress could offer to buy the negative film for every complete work or volume copied by an American library, a master file of negatives could be assembled and listed. If a library or an organization sponsoring a microfilm project preferred to do so, there would, of course, be no objection to its paying for its own negatives and keeping them, provided it listed them at the national centre.

Microcopies, presumably, are usually wanted of relatively rare books of genuine research value, so there is a fair chance that additional copies will be needed eventually. Does a plan of this sort seem practicable? Could listing be kept sufficiently up to date so that requests would not have to be cleared through the Library of Congress before films were made? It is to be expected that most foreign requests will be directed to the Library of Congress in any case.

The report of the Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning that has been cited calls attention to a number of other problems that ought to be studied.²⁸⁵ These include costs and the need for develop-

ing a simple system of collecting charges for small orders. In this connection, the practice of some governmental agencies, state universities, and other organizations, in requiring estimates before a thirty-cent job is done, plus billing in quintuplicate or worse, ought to be discouraged, though it usually seems to be required by legal provisions.

The Committee also urged foundations to encourage coordination of services, commented on the desirability of an inexpensive reading machine, suggested that more attention be given to the quality of microfilm, and indicated its belief that further promotional work by a wide variety of organizations was wanted. It did not overlook the matter of copyright and called for "cautious exploration" of that subject, which is to be considered in a later memorandum.

Reproduction for Republication.—Two of the Committee's recommendations involve microfilm as a means of republication rather than as a substitute for interlibrary loan. These are its statement that "the filming of newspapers should continue largely with funds furnished locally," and its proposal for an experimental project by libraries in filming materials other than newspapers that have been printed on disintegrating pulp paper.

Filming as a substitute for loan involves an edition of one made in response to a specific request. Republication, on the other hand, implies the issuing of several copies, usually of a group or collection of volumes not available in a sufficient number of full-size copies to meet library needs. In the case of newspapers, microrepublication may be the economical—or even the only practicable—method of acquisition and permanent preservation.

The project for filming English books published before 1600 was begun in 1935, and subscribing libraries have received annually approximately 100,000 pages at a cost of one-half cent each. Indexes are supplied and catalogue cards may be purchased. Later, the same company, University Microfilms, Inc., began the copying of all American periodicals printed before 1826.²⁸⁶ *British Sessional Papers* are the subject of a pioneer microprint project by Boni.²⁸⁷ There have been numerous newspaper reproduction projects; 150 American titles were available by 1945,²⁸⁸ and Harvard has been filming fifty foreign papers since 1938. Local archives have been filmed in some areas. More than six million pages of early British manuscripts were copied during the war for the ACLS under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Negatives of these are on deposit at the Library of Congress.²⁸⁹ Beginning in 1942, a project for filming enemy publications was inaugurated, and more than 14,000 issues of serials were photographed during the next three years.²⁹⁰ This, of course, was in addition to the Alien Property Custodian's program for full-size republication, under which 3,200 issues of 116 titles, and about 700 individual books, were reproduced.²⁹¹ The need for further republication of both kinds will be considered in the memorandum on rehabilitation.

Power has noted that the foregoing enterprises demonstrate the value of microfilm as insurance against loss or unnecessary use of rare or irreplaceable books and manuscripts, as a means of securing permanent copies of materials of an ephemeral nature, and as an economical method of obtaining copies of material in distant depositories.²⁹²

There have been many proposals for new projects, some of a very ambitious nature, such as the IIC's plan of 1929 for assembling a universal library on microfilm.²⁹³

The original article on microphotography for library purposes in 1907 included a drawing of a library card with a normal printed entry below which seventy-two pages were to be reproduced in film.²⁹⁴ Technical difficulties, however, have slowed down the development of sheet microfilm, while the strip and reel, with their obvious disadvantages from the library standpoint, have been the normal forms.

The possibilities of microprint, the idea of putting the microcopy on the verso of a catalogue card, and the prospect of greater reduction ratios than were possible in 1907 led Rider to advance his plan for microcards.²⁹⁵ As originally presented, this appeared to be a scheme for getting everything—including analytics for all serial articles—into one catalogue; but Metcalf's demonstration that the catalogue envisaged for the twenty-first century was scarcely less terrifying than the 200,000,000 volume library it was to replace²⁹⁶ caused Rider to retreat to the ground that analytics were "in no sense an essential feature," though he still maintained that extremely high reduction ratios were also nonessential because research materials "come in small packages."²⁹⁷

Microbibliography—the production of subject bibliographies or indexes provided with supplements containing the full text in microprint of the materials they list—has been suggested as a possible alter-

native to the card.²⁹⁸ If it is reasonable to expect that initial microprint projects will involve collections of material similar to the early English books or the American periodicals that have been the field for pioneer projects in microfilm republication,²⁹⁹ then microbibliography seems to offer a number of advantages in convenience of use.

Such proposals indicate, at least, that microprint, whether in card or book form, may be considered fully as promising as microfilm was in 1907 or before. It is to be hoped that thirty years will not have to elapse before it is generally used by libraries. Paradoxically, it would probably be easier to start a major project if it seemed very likely that there would be no important technical improvements during the next few months or years. As it is, there is natural reluctance to subscribe to a project and to acquire reading machines that may be outmoded before the project is completed.

One important question in this connection is suggested by the difference of opinion between Miss Bennett and Rider. She writes that, if we are to have simple and inexpensive reading machines, "there will have to be a definite area magnified by them at one time. . . . We cannot ask a manufacturer to design a single reading machine which will enable us to read from one to five hundred pages of print on a three by five space."³⁰⁰ Rider, though he does not meet the objection squarely, seems to think there is no difficulty in making a machine that will handle a wide range of reduction ratios.³⁰¹ If this is so, such a machine ought to be developed, and, as soon as it has been, a major project should be undertaken in microcard or microbibliography production—or perhaps, as an experiment, in both.

Microfilm and Microprint for Original Publication.—Microfilm has already been used—and microprint, if successful at all, is sure to be used—for still a third purpose, i.e., as a new medium for original publication, sometimes described as "auxiliary publication." It has been suggested, indeed, that the initial microcard project might be of this sort in the field of theses.³⁰² In microfilm, the ADI has had an auxiliary publication program, Brown University has issued mathematical theses,³⁰³ and Power's organization has secured approval by eleven universities of microfilm reproduction as meeting publication requirements for the doctorate. Abstracts of theses are published twice a year, catalogue cards are distributed by the Library of Congress,

and microfilm copies of the full dissertations are available at one and one-quarter cents per page. The cost to the author is only fifteen dollars.³⁰⁴

There have been a number of proposals that periodicals develop auxiliary publication schemes for supplementary material and data in very specialized fields.³⁰⁵ Some of these suggestions appear to be related to much older proposals for general distribution of separates in place of periodicals.³⁰⁶ Ideas of this sort, which have recently been revived at UNESCO preparatory discussions,³⁰⁷ were behind the world encyclopedia plan of the IIB,³⁰⁸ as well as later suggestions for loose-leaf or card encyclopedias and handbooks.³⁰⁹

Photographic reproduction, though not in greatly reduced scale, has made possible the appearance of the Library of Congress catalogue of printed cards in book form; microfilm has also been found useful in the assembling of union catalogues, as in the case of the Philadelphia project,³¹⁰ and in copying portions of catalogues for special purposes.³¹¹ It was reported that, at the outbreak of the war, a copying device had been developed for making full-size, legible, and durable reproductions of cards without removing them from their trays.³¹² Punched card sorting methods plus automatic cameras have been proposed for the mechanical collection and reproduction of bibliographies.³¹³ Finally, the use of microfilm in mechanical brains, as imagined by Bush,³¹⁴ is perhaps a little too far in the future to call for discussion at this meeting. (But *cf.* discussion, page 26.)

It should be noted that the use of microfilm in connection with exchanges and exhibits will be mentioned in the memoranda devoted to those topics.

Library uses of microfilm and microprint have not, relatively, offered an extremely profitable field for commercial producers of film and equipment, and it would be unrealistic to expect the manufacturers to invest very large funds in research on library needs. A few laboratories connected with academic institutions have received foundation grants, but it can be argued, in view of the potentialities, that considerably larger amounts might prove to be good investments from the standpoint of librarianship and research in general.

What can be done to get funds for experimentation, particularly in microprint? Can subsidies be found for an initial project? In what field should such a project be attempted?

It has been proposed that the Library of Congress serve as the centre for film requests, but an advisory service in microphotography, involving commercial processes and products, might operate more freely if not connected with the government. The ALA Committee has given libraries what advice it could but has had to do so with very little financial support. Can an advisory service be financed?

Should UNESCO be asked to undertake research, standardization efforts, and advisory activities in this field? Should it not, at least, do what it can to encourage establishment of microcopy facilities at national interlibrary loan and bibliographical centres?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Rice questioned the statement in the Memorandum that the major function of microphotography even now is as a substitute for interlibrary loan, pointing out that it is used more extensively for newspapers, for reproduction of material on poor paper, and for copying items that cannot be obtained in any other way, than as a substitute for loan.

In reply to the chairman's question, "What is holding microphotography back?" Mr. David said, "The fact that readers don't like to use it." He believed that patience is the only remedy; habits will change eventually.

Mr. Boyd wondered if the major international possibilities of microreproduction might lie in the direction of telephotoc transmission of texts. Mr. Shaw replied that there are a number of promising processes, including diazo and the Bush system. Discussion ought not to be limited to microphotography alone. Each tool, moreover, has its economic limits, and, for short runs of material, it is cheaper, if the time wasted in going to and from reading machines is counted, for the scholar to use full-sized or substantially full-sized copies. Since Binkley's death, he added, there has been no real study of such questions, and the time seems to have come for renewed investigation. Only if librarians have determined what is economically sound can they concentrate on the right processes and make real progress. UNESCO might study the subject, or the Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning might be revived. Mr. Boyd mentioned the fact that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is considering the

establishment of a laboratory for photographic reproduction studies.

Mr. David raised the question of standardization, reporting that Mr. Power had recently discovered in Paris that, as against the film roll which is standard in this country, the French have developed the practice of cutting film into strips ten or eleven inches long and inserting these in labeled envelopes which stand on the shelves like volumes. If material is sent here from Europe in this form it will complicate the handling of microfilm in American libraries.

Mr. Peiss added that the French have developed a machine especially adapted to reading these short strips. In England the Royal Society of Medicine, which has a Rockefeller Foundation grant for reproduction and distribution to devastated libraries of wartime medical periodicals, is planning to distribute the films in this form and supply reading machines with them. There is a German process for making film strips resembling microcards, and a camera has been invented which makes it unnecessary to cut up a book before reproducing it in this form. A technique has also been developed for putting a catalogue entry at the top of the film. A reading machine for the product has been designed to sell at 150 marks, and the inventor is trying to set up a factory in the American zone.

Mr. Shaw reported that a French device of this nature had proved to be a fraud, but Mr. Peiss replied that he had seen the German machine himself. Mr. Shaw added that a description of the French process described by Mr. David is to be found in the *Compagnie Française Thomson-Houston: Revue Technique des Départements Radio*, No. 3 (July 1945). The plan was in use in England as long ago as 1938, Mr. Metcalf reported, when the British, at the Oxford documentation meeting, had urged American adoption of it.

Mr. Flynn noted that Professor Reyniers of Notre Dame had been working on a similar method and is said to have perfected a camera that makes the exposures simply and rapidly. Mr. Shaw pointed out that the system is suitable for scientific articles, not for newspaper files. Mr. Peiss added that the French are publishing two or three new scientific journals on microfilm strips, and Mr. Rice suggested that, in spite of Mr. Power's perturbation, experiment in new methods of this sort is needed.

Mr. Flynn hoped that something could be done to stimulate Edwards Brothers to proceed with plans for miniature offset repro-

duction of journals that can be marketed only in small editions, and to encourage some of the optical companies to produce portable reading devices for bringing miniature offset printing up to easily legible size. Those concerned with *Biological Abstracts* have felt that these steps are essential in order to provide copies of journals for which the demand is too limited to justify facsimile offset, of publications too bulky in their original format for easy use and of other volumes or large sets that have gone out of print and cannot economically be reproduced in full size. A portable, inexpensive reading machine that does not cause eyestrain is needed.

With reference to republication, Mr. Metcalf said that the world demand ought to be determined before reproductions are made. If new methods make it possible to produce twice as many new publications, other problems will be complicated.

Mr. Boyd spoke of a proposal by Sargent B. Child for an international reproduction program calling for extensive copying in Europe. Its weakness, he thought, was its connection with reparations, since it had provided that German industry would be required to produce the instruments and German technicians to do the copying. But the result would have been a copy of everything in libraries and museums throughout Europe, both as insurance against destruction and as a means of supplying the needs of scholars.

A comprehensive program of this sort—but not depending on reparations—might, Mr. Boyd suggested, solve the problem of inter-library loan and simplify the indexing question. The sums spent in past years to send scholars from one country to another to copy books and manuscripts would finance reproduction of great blocks of material. Mr. Metcalf suggested that this, essentially, would be an extension of the American Council of Learned Societies' wartime British program, which had involved the use of ten cameras for several years.

He wondered whether, for example, Mr. Boyd would approve of copying everything in the British Museum that is not recorded in the American union catalogue. Mr. Boyd replied in the affirmative, recalling that Binkley had been working toward that, and Mr. Metcalf estimated that, if there are two and one-half million pieces to be copied at the British Museum, the job would cost approximately five million dollars.

Mr. Shaw reported that the Department of Agriculture had arranged with several countries to establish dollar credits for their use in the United States in return for photographic copies of materials not available here. Such projects are now in process in Holland and Poland, and other libraries might be interested in making similar arrangements.

Mr. Downs pointed out that there are two distinct problems—one involving large-scale microfilm projects, while the other seemed to call for photo-offset or a similar process to reproduce journals needed in a considerable number of copies. Mr. Shaw suggested that the conference might strongly recommend that UNESCO set up a mechanism for determining the world demand for such journals.

Mr. Evans doubted that photo-offset could be handled by librarians rather than by the publishing industry. Librarians—or UNESCO—may cooperate by determining and making known the demand; it is then up to publishers to supply it. Libraries had little to do with the Alien Property Custodian's program for offset reproduction except to report to Edwards Brothers how many subscriptions they would take. Microfilm is a quite different matter, for it is a question of getting into the country a copy of something for which there is an uncertain or potential demand, and cooperation is needed.

Mr. Fleming believed that in some cases libraries are buying microfilm when, if they would get together, it would be preferable to buy miniature or even facsimile print. Each library supposes that it is the only one interested in an item, while, in fact, there may be forty or seventy others that would buy copies. There should be some central organization with which requests could be filed. Mr. Milczewski observed, however, that there is a problem of timing—how long should such a centre wait, letting requests for an item accumulate, before it takes steps to meet them?

Recalling the Binkley Joint Committee on Materials for Research, and the Stewart-Conant Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning, Mr. Metcalf suggested that some comparable organization is needed now to study costs, demands, and other problems that have been mentioned. Mr. Shaw added that this involved relations with the FID, since documentation institutes are normally concerned with the same questions.

Mr. Clapp reported that the Periodicals Committee of the ALA

is making a census of requests for missing numbers of British periodicals; once it is known how much wartime foreign material will come to this country in the original, similar efforts will be necessary on an international scale.

Mr. Evans added that periodicals from Germany are being listed as they are distributed under the Library of Congress Mission program. Possibly a list of gaps could also be prepared, if the cooperating libraries are willing to meet the additional costs. Libraries would then be asked to report materials they received through sources other than the Mission. Several of those present reported that their libraries would be glad to help finance this scheme. Mr. Brown hoped that other nations would compile similar lists of gaps through their national libraries.

Cooperative Acquisition and Specialization

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

Centralized or cooperative buying of books is something quite distinct from specialization in acquisition. The two may go together, but, if libraries are buying the same books for the most part, cooperative purchase is likely to offer greater economies than if they are reducing duplication by specializing in different fields. Cooperative buying may be a very desirable enterprise for small public libraries, but specialization is usually considered a means of increasing resources for research.

Buying, the simpler of the two forms of cooperation, will be considered first. It may be regarded as a natural outgrowth of such cooperative critical book selection aids as the *A.L.A. Catalog*, though it was suggested by Root as worthy of particular attention in acquisition of replacements and out-of-print titles.³¹⁵ Purchasing for state institutions was reported in 1926 to be centralized in Michigan and New Hampshire, while the Ontario Department of Education bought books for fifty small libraries, and the Oregon State Library was a purchasing agent for school district libraries.³¹⁶

Probably the most extensive experiment in cooperative buying that has been attempted in the United States was in connection with the Carnegie Corporation's grants to college and junior college libraries between 1929 and 1939. An advisory group, including college presidents, deans, and librarians, was formed under the chairmanship of Bishop in 1928. It surveyed the libraries and sponsored preparation of the *Shaw List of Books for College Libraries*. As a result of its recommendations, the Corporation made grants totaling a little more

than one million dollars for book purchases by eighty-three colleges. The money was to be spent over a five-year period, and a central purchasing office was established in March 1931 to handle the bulk of expenditures under the grants. Bishop has estimated that this office saved the colleges more than \$100,000, or from 10 to 15 per cent of total expenditures. It also located many out-of-print books that would not have been easily obtainable by a college library order department. In 1937, following establishment of a Junior College Library Advisory Group and publication of the Mohrhardt *List of Books for Junior College Libraries*, ninety-two grants totaling \$300,000 were made to junior colleges to be spent over a term of three years. Centralized buying was used for this program too, and the estimated saving amounted to 27.5 per cent of the list price of the books. In both cases, selection was left entirely in the hands of the colleges. Bishop has pointed out that the great advantage of centralized buying for colleges is that many of them lack the bibliographical tools and the familiarity with the book trade that a central office can supply.³¹⁷

Other American and numerous foreign examples of centralization could be found, of course, but perhaps the most remarkable is the Norwegian Folkeboksamlingenes Ekspedsjon, which binds all public library copies of books purchased from the selective catalogue issued by the national library office, prints Dewey and Cutter numbers on the bindings, supplies each volume with book pockets and cards as well as with printed catalogue cards, and sends it to the library post free. It keeps on hand a stock of ready-bound volumes and is said to supply immediately 80 per cent of titles ordered.³¹⁸ The U.S. Department of State, which is now operating libraries throughout the world, might find it desirable to consider setting up a system of this sort.

Turning to international cooperation and to research libraries, an interesting recent activity has been the program for cooperative purchase in China announced by Brown late in 1943.³¹⁹ The first arrangements were made by an ALA committee, but the project is supervised by a joint committee representing the participating libraries. Each institution was asked to transmit \$1,000 to the ALA, and purchases in China were handled by the Chinese Library Association.³²⁰ By the end of 1945 it was possible to report that thirteen libraries were taking

part and, in spite of exchange difficulties, 3,250 volumes had been received at a cost of \$6,000. Broadening of the program was urged.³²¹

Recent procurement activities of the Library of Congress and the Department of State, since they involve specialization, will be considered later in this memorandum. Apropos of China, it may be added here that in 1943 a proposed cultural program for Sino-American relations suggested the establishment of an American library in China and indicated that one function of this library would be to facilitate American acquisition of Chinese publications.³²² It has already been pointed out that cooperative American acquisition has been included in ALA programs for Latin American relations.³²³

Centralization of foreign acquisitions has been recommended in England,³²⁴ and it has been hoped that the system developed under the National Central Library might lead to cooperative purchase.³²⁵ Laski's suggestions for the postwar period do not call for centralized buying, but provide for the establishment of twelve central libraries, each with funds sufficient to purchase all desirable books published in the country, and for setting up a National Library Council under the Ministry of Education. Among the functions of this body are the reprinting of rare books and the purchase of books or manuscripts that ought to be retained in an English library. The twelve central regional libraries are to be depositories for local records.³²⁶

It should be noted, finally, that cooperative acquisition has also been suggested from the international subject approach.³²⁷

In beginning a discussion of specialization, one might well take as a text Pafford's dictum that "The value of any effort made in organizing co-operation, and any result from it, as in the matter of specialization, is only to be judged as good if it eventually makes a permanent improvement in a library's service to its readers."³²⁸ Downs has stated six principles to be taken into consideration in specialization agreements: Distance is a handicap; complete elimination of duplication may not be possible or desirable; loan regulations should not be too strict; each institution must have something to contribute; agreements should be positive, rather than commitments *not* to do something; and agreements must be flexible to provide for expansion and adjustment.³²⁹ White, approaching the problem from the viewpoint of the university, has also emphasized positive agreements, has pointed out that collections must support the program of instruction

and that elimination of unnecessary duplication of educational effort is desirable, and has recommended safeguarding the continuity of educational and library policy, recognition of the limits of cooperation, and broadening of its base by efforts to reduce overlapping in publishing projects.³³⁰

Pafford, it has been seen, believes that a tendency toward specialization results from the development of interlibrary loan.³³¹ When a loan system is coupled with a union catalogue, the institutions whose holdings are recorded may, indeed, be thought of as forming a single library comparable to a municipal library and its branches or a university collection with its departmental and special libraries. In this situation it seems inevitable that the idea of increasing total resources by eliminating unnecessary duplication should arise.

Germany, a leader in lending and in union catalogue development, was likewise a leader in specialization, though Pafford notes that this was also encouraged by the existence of the German states, a political situation that made it necessary for a great number of medium-sized libraries to serve one national community. He reports that completion of the union catalogue of eleven Prussian libraries showed that 60 per cent of the titles were represented by a single copy.³³² While another author gives 50 per cent as the figure,³³³ there can be no doubt that duplication was remarkably slight.

The emergency that followed the first world war was another stimulus to German specialization. The *Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft*, founded in 1920, centralized both purchase and exchange acquisition of foreign publications, listed serial files, and arranged for their completion, filling two thousand gaps in sixty libraries.³³⁴ It may be described as the most successful major effort that has been made to secure a maximum return from the book budgets of a nation's research libraries. When rehabilitation is discussed, it will be seen that there is now a great need for organizations of this sort in the devastated nations to make restoration programs effective.

In France, during the period between the two wars, considerable progress was made in specialization by Parisian libraries, particularly in the field of foreign serials.³³⁵

Like the French, Americans have succeeded chiefly on a local scale thus far, though American distances and lack of centralization in most

respects suggest that the problems of the two nations differ considerably. Chicago and New York City specialization agreements date from 1895 and 1896;³³⁶ Minneapolis, Cleveland, and Boston are among the cities that have agreements of one sort or another, and there have been some statewide efforts.³³⁷ The successful arrangements at Nashville and between Duke and the University of North Carolina are also well known, and the importance of a union catalogue in such cases is evident.³³⁸ An agreement on newspapers is in effect in Virginia, and a regional agreement on specialization was reached in 1944 at a conference sponsored by the Pacific Northwest Library Association. The regional bibliographical centre acts as a clearinghouse for this program.³³⁹

Proposals for specialization have been more numerous and often on a larger scale than accomplishments. The Paris congress of 1923 formally recommended acquisition agreements between libraries having a union catalogue,³⁴⁰ while nearly thirty years before, Van der Haeghen had urged agreement between Belgian and Dutch libraries on a division of responsibility in connection with their proposed union catalogue.³⁴¹ McColvin suggested specialization in England in 1934,³⁴² and postwar plans of the Library Association, as noted in the memorandum on interlibrary loan, call for development of at least one reference and one lending collection, both as nearly complete as possible, in each subject. National grants for purchases by these libraries in their special fields are recommended, and periodicals are mentioned as particularly suitable for cooperative acquisition and specialization. A survey of resources is regarded as prerequisite to establishment of the plan.³⁴³

Specialization and cooperative purchase were proposed at a Chinese library conference in 1929, and, while nation-wide plans had not been worked out, it was reported in 1935 that some local understandings were in effect.³⁴⁴

In the United States, Putnam, as early as 1896, testified that the Library of Congress ought to take into account the holdings of other libraries in plans for building its own collections.³⁴⁵ Specialization was recommended by Andrews in 1916³⁴⁶ and by Root in 1922;³⁴⁷ Keogh declared that governmental needs during the first world war had demonstrated the necessity for it.³⁴⁸ In 1916 the ALI had adopted a "plan of cooperation by specialization," which called for libraries with

like specialties to organize in order that at least one reference and one circulating copy of the books on each subject could be found in each of seven regions of the United States.³⁴⁹ An adaptation of this scheme was promoted by the ALA Bibliography Committee under the chairmanship of Richardson.³⁵⁰ Including cooperative selection, purchase, and union cataloguing of books not already in the United States, this was approved by the ALA Council in 1926, as well as by the ALI, American Bibliographical Society, and American Historical Association.³⁵¹ Efforts were made to start on an experimental scale by an agreement of theological libraries³⁵² or, at an earlier date, by an arrangement involving Harvard, Yale, Chicago, and Princeton.³⁵³

Establishment of regions in which periodical purchases would be coordinated by agreement was proposed by Cannon in 1929. As in the case of the Richardson programs, union lists and lending were features of the plan.³⁵⁴ Hopes of specialization were, of course, in the minds of many of those who participated in the union catalogue movement during the years after 1930.³⁵⁵ A conference on library specialization was held in 1941, and discussion centred on the questions of whether more information on holdings must be collected before a program could begin, whether regional experiments should precede national efforts, and whether first attempts should be confined to any special group of libraries. It was agreed that a start ought to be made on a national scale, and it was suggested that two or more comprehensive collections, at least in some subjects, would be desirable as insurance. The importance of the Library of Congress and of the national union catalogue was emphasized.³⁵⁶ Kellar, a year later, reported that a majority of librarians interviewed had favored coordinated purchase agreements and a code of fair collecting practices.³⁵⁷

Before considering the Farmington proposal, which is the final item, chronologically, in this series of comprehensive plans, attempts at coordination in special subject fields should be noted, particularly those in Latin American studies. A Conference on Bibliography and the Concentration of Research Materials in this field was held in 1939 and was able to agree, at least, that a survey ought to be made.³⁵⁸ The Hispanic Foundation at the Library of Congress has interested itself in the building up of adequate collections by college and university libraries and the establishment of a national system for the

use of research materials.³⁵⁹ More recently, Hanke has reported adoption by the Library of Congress of an Hispanic acquisition policy designed to protect rare books from unscrupulous collectors. American libraries will be asked to cooperate, and it has been hoped that a comparable UNESCO policy may be established to protect the cultural patrimony of all nations.³⁶⁰ The need for a policy of this sort in postwar Europe has been noted by Besterman.³⁶¹

A "proposal for a division of responsibility among American libraries in the acquisition and recording of library materials," which can be cited more economically as the Farmington proposal, was drawn up in 1942 by Boyd, MacLeish, and Metcalf acting as a committee of the Librarian's Council of the Library of Congress. It was approved by many individuals, as well as by representatives of the ALA, ARL, Council of National Library Associations, and American Council of Learned Societies. It provides for a cooperative undertaking limited for the time being to current books and pamphlets in the regular book trade and printed in the Latin alphabet. Cooperating institutions would agree that at least one copy of every book and pamphlet included shall be acquired by an American library, promptly processed, and listed in the national union catalogue. A staff would be employed to prepare a classification scheme, survey existing special collections, survey world book production by country and subject in order to estimate probable costs of making current acquisitions complete, solicit offers of specialization from libraries, arrange for allocation of fields, and announce such allocations after governing bodies of cooperating institutions have agreed to them. Libraries would be asked to accept responsibility for comprehensive coverage of their chosen fields, not to reduce their purchases in any subject. It was believed that the central office might find it desirable to arrange for cooperative buying from some nations, and cooperative cataloguing was also anticipated. A classed union catalogue at the Library of Congress was recommended.³⁶²

The proposal, since it is national rather than regional, faces the obstacle of distances, but it appears to meet the requirements of the other principles formulated by Downs and White. Funds have not become available for financing the preliminary steps that have been summarized, and little more has been possible, in direct action along the lines of the plan, than the publication a year ago of a study of

American acquisitions as measured against book production of eight countries. Periodicals, public documents, textbooks of lower than college level, legal, medical, and juvenile literature, music scores, translations from other modern languages, and reprints were excluded from this study. A list of 2,921 titles—a sampling of total annual book production by eight countries of 17,715 titles—was checked by sixty major libraries. Uneven national coverage was indicated by the fact that this group of libraries acquired less than one-fifth of all Italian and Belgian books, while four-fifths of all Canadian and Mexican titles were found in the United States. An equally wide range in subject collecting was revealed, with four-fifths of all titles on bibliography and librarianship located, compared to only 14 per cent in technology. It was found that 85.5 per cent of all titles located anywhere in the country were held by the four largest libraries; other institutions made relatively slight contributions to the total resources of the country. From the financial standpoint, it was found that \$4,564 would have brought to this country one copy of every title not acquired from the eight countries, and that the cost of complete acquisition for any single subject would have been relatively low.³⁶³

The study in question amounted to little more than a partial substantiation of some of the hypotheses on which the Farmington proposal was based; but, as noted, it can be described as the only direct progress that has been made to date. Fortunately, however, developments along closely related lines have been much more important and encouraging.

Early in the war the government found it necessary to make arrangements for the acquisition of European publications, and it became evident that government channels would be the only ones available for acquisition of library materials in the period immediately following liberation or, in enemy countries, for some time after the end of hostilities. It was obvious that arrangements were needed for the allocation in this country of material that could be acquired by the government.³⁶⁴ In August 1945, MacLeish, then Assistant Secretary of State, wrote to the Librarian of Congress that "The Department of State agrees with the Library's view that the national interest is directly affected by the holdings of many of the private research libraries. It would, therefore, interpose no objection in principle to

the employment of Federal Government facilities to assist in maintaining these specialized collections where normal channels of acquisition are inoperative. . . . The Department would wish to be assured that the private libraries had agreed upon and carefully planned a program of cooperative buying and that they would continue to support such a plan as long as Federal assistance was granted them. . . ."³⁶⁵

Articles by Clapp³⁶⁶ and Peiss³⁶⁷ have told of the steps taken to reach an allocation agreement and have described the European procurement activities of the Library of Congress Mission. There is some cause for hope that the subject allocations agreed upon for this project may, with suitable adjustments, serve as a basis for further cooperation along the lines of the proposal.

A Russian acquisitions program involving exchange on a large scale as well as purchase has also been under consideration for more than a year.³⁶⁸ Specialization agreement in Chinese publications has been suggested,³⁶⁹ and first results of an attempt at cooperative buying were noted earlier in this memorandum. A Library of Congress mission to Japan is also a possibility.

The Farmington proposal appears to be supported, at least in theory, by a large majority of librarians; cooperation with it has been designated by the ALA as a desirable means of governmental participation in international library relations,³⁷⁰ and it has the support of the Librarian of Congress.³⁷¹ The announcement that trained, full-time officers of the foreign service are to be designated for publication procurement seems to indicate an opportunity for further action. A coordinated acquisitions program for federal government libraries is materializing, and the procurement officers will serve all government libraries wherever commercial channels are insufficient.³⁷²

The precedent has already been established that governmental aid in acquisition may be given to research libraries participating in a plan for specialization. There are very few countries in which commercial channels are adequate for comprehensive acquisitions of the sort suggested in the proposal.

Is it, then, reasonable to propose an arrangement whereby procurement officers would attempt to acquire one or two copies of every publication, and the Library of Congress would distribute these acquisitions to specializing libraries, governmental or not?

Many other questions may be asked. Has experience of the past three years indicated a need for revision of the Farmington proposal? Are there prospects of financing it now? Can further progress be made without financial aid? Is the time opportune to make another effort in the field of serials?

Are there not countries other than China and Russia in which cooperative buying should be attempted?

As in the field of bibliography, proponents of selectivity object to uncritical collection. In bibliography it has been suggested that true selection is possible only after collection and examination of all that is available. Advocates of the Farmington proposal have pointed out that every library except the one that specializes in a subject can afford to be more selective if assured that there is a comprehensive collection somewhere in the country. The problem of what ought to be kept and what is not worth preserving even in a single library is bound to arise again, however, if specialization brings really comprehensive collections. Should it be considered now?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Referring to Mr. Downs' six principles of specialization agreements as cited in page 57 of the Memorandum, Mr. Evans argued that there must be some element of negative agreement in any such arrangement; if a library is given top priority in a field, other institutions must agree not to compete with it. Mr. Metcalf believed that this would not be necessary in the case of current materials after normal channels of trade had been reopened, but agreed that it is true of the German acquisitions program under the Library of Congress Mission. Mr. Evans thought that, in any case, there would be some publications so scarce that only two or three copies would ever get to this country. Mr. Rice suggested that perhaps the statement ought to read "Agreements in general should be positive. . . ." Another suggestion was "Agreements should be positive, rather than merely commitments not to do something." Mr. Downs agreed, provided such agreements were kept flexible.

Mr. Peiss asked what percentage of the printing output of France, for example, would be brought to this country under the Farmington plan. In reply to a question, Mr. Williams reported that there had

been practically no selection, within the categories covered, in preparing the check lists on which his article³⁶³ had been based. Mr. Peiss wondered how much difference of opinion there was, even among those present, on the definition of "research value." He had estimated that about half of the trade books issued in Switzerland during the war years were of research value.

Mr. Shaw believed that it would be possible to go a long way with the Farmington plan before acquisitions became nearly complete enough to make the problem a practical one, but Mr. Peiss maintained that it would be desirable to decide, as specifically as possible at the outset, what is wanted in this country for research purposes. Mr. Shaw remarked that the Office of Strategic Services wants comic books.

Questions brought out the fact that the Farmington proposal, since it was conceived only as a first step, leaves out books in non-Latin alphabets and all periodicals.

Mr. Metcalf asked if the group would approve of proposing, at the next meeting of the ARL, that a start on the Farmington plan be made next year with publications of three countries: Sweden, Switzerland, and Germany. The first named is a comparatively small country with a language which relatively few librarians and research workers read, the second represents the two most widely read foreign languages, and the third seems to call for cooperative effort because of the difficulties to be anticipated in acquiring material from it during the coming year.

Replying to questions, Mr. Metcalf said that the allocation of priorities would not necessarily be the same as had been made for acquisitions of the Library of Congress Mission. He thought the simplest method of acquisition might be to find a dealer in Switzerland, for example, who would agree to collect all material he believed to be of research value on the basis of the best definition that the ARL could provide. Mr. Metcalf hoped the plan could be extended, but thought it might be best to make a start with the three countries in question. If a library took a subject for one or all of these countries, it would not necessarily be committed to take the same subject for all other countries.

Mr. Vosper strongly seconded the idea of centring acquisitions in a selected dealer; it would be bad, he thought, if libraries were left

to their individual resources in finding a means of getting everything called for under the proposal. Mr. Peiss believed that, for Switzerland, a single dealer might well handle medicine, law, and related sciences, while a second could take care of everything else.

Mr. Fleming urged the necessity of increasing the number of subject divisions from the 250 used under the Library of Congress program. Mr. Metcalf doubted that as many as 250 would be needed for Sweden, but agreed that, for major countries, many more might be desirable.

There was some discussion as to whether any nation other than the United States is ready to consider inclusive acquisition of this kind. Mr. Peiss reported that the Russians have ordered at least one copy of every title published in Switzerland during the war, and Mr. Heindel added that they have also ordered one copy of every American title.

Mr. Downs, seconded by Mr. Babb, moved that the proposal made by Mr. Metcalf be referred to the ARL for action. Mr. Clapp urged that explanatory material be distributed in advance of the ARL meeting, and Mr. Boyd hoped there would be a realization that action taken by libraries now involves continuing commitments; he feared that this had not been generally understood in connection with the Library of Congress Mission allotments. Mr. Babb called attention to the necessity for reconsideration of these allocations, and Mr. Rice pointed out that, while an undertaking to cover Swedish or Swiss publications on a subject would not commit a library to do so for all other countries, it would, in many cases, be unfortunate if the same library did not cover a subject on a world-wide basis. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. David believed that more time should be found for ARL meetings; a single session is insufficient. Mr. Rice said that additional time could be allotted only if the meeting were deferred until after the ALA sessions; it was also recalled that independent ARL meetings had been held in New York. There was some feeling that a separate meeting of this kind ought to be devoted to consideration of the recommendation on the Farmington plan, and the suggestion was referred to Mr. Rice as Executive Secretary of the ARL.

The discussion then turned to serials. Mr. Evans believed that these should be handled separately from monographs because of

the special problems they present. They can be selected in advance and listed, and arrangements can be made to get them. A specialization agreement for serials might be linked to the serial listing that had been discussed earlier. Mr. Shaw added that a great many serials are not available in the trade, and, because of the large proportion of society publications, the problem of acquisition is not the same as for books. He agreed with Mr. Metcalf, however, that a library accepting responsibility for books in a subject should also acquire the serials in that field. Mr. Fleming wondered if the same statement should not be applied also to government documents.

During the past year, Mr. Peiss reported, Switzerland had produced a complete catalogue of periodicals, including the more important nontrade items. It is a classified list with an alphabetic index, the *Schweizerischer Zeitschriften- und Zeitungskatalog*, issued by the Schweizerisches Vereinssortiment at Olten.

Mr. Evans moved that UNESCO be asked to recommend that one of the first bibliographical projects of each member nation be a comprehensive listing of all current serial titles. The motion was seconded by Mr. David and, after Mr. Brown had called attention to the fact that such lists should give full bibliographical details, was unanimously carried.

In view of the existence of the Swiss list, Mr. David wondered if there were any reason why the Farmington plan should not be extended to Swiss periodicals at the outset. Mr. Downs suggested the difficulty of classifying general periodicals and those that treat several subjects.

Mr. Metcalf said it appeared likely that the government libraries in Washington would develop their own acquisition program, more or less independently of the rest of the country, for materials they need. But, in the case of items of value in connection with the security of the United States, it might be desirable to see to it that a second copy goes to some library outside Washington.

Mr. Shaw recalled that research libraries have often had competent men examine and estimate the adequacy of their collections. The Williams study of acquisitions from eight countries had suggested a somewhat different procedure to him, and he had recently obtained the services of a Hungarian, who is determining what sources of information there are for Hungarian publications (including current

books, periodicals, and documents), listing sources of retrospective book trade information, and preparing check lists of all Hungarian publications relating to agriculture. These lists are then to be checked to determine the extent to which Hungarian materials are represented in the Department of Agriculture Library and other collections. It appears that not more than 12 to 14 per cent of the Hungarian agricultural material will be located in this country.

In any case, the Department of Agriculture hopes to develop an acquisitions program covering both commercial and noncommercial channels in cooperation with the Department of State, which has assisted in locating additional sources for current information on books. Similar studies, aimed at defining the publications procurement officer program of the State Department in other countries, might well be made by graduate students in library schools. The Department has indicated its willingness to cooperate and may be able to employ such students during their summer vacations. Mr. John H. Ottemiller, Acting Chief, Reference Division, Department of State, is the man to consult.

In reply to questions, Mr. Shaw reported that the initial study is covering agriculture and its underlying sciences, including biology and agricultural economics. He added that the war brought to light large areas in which American libraries had been criminally neglectful in acquisitions, and it had cost millions of dollars to make up, even in part, for the resulting gaps. The fact that most Americans do not read Bulgarian does not justify nonacquisition of important work done in Bulgaria. A systematic plan is needed to determine the potential and more nearly realize it.

Mr. Heindel suggested the use of foreign information officers in this country. Legations might welcome the opportunity to assist with acquisitions under the Farmington plan. Mr. Shaffer added that he had encountered great willingness on the part of educational and other attachés in Washington to give help of this sort, and Miss Ludington reported that very considerable aid had been received from the French Information Service in New York in response to a recent request.

Recalling the original terms of the Farmington proposal, Mr. Clapp wondered if the ARL still considered it essential to create a classified record of all materials acquired. Mr. Evans wished to waive

any obligation of the Library of Congress to assemble such a subject union catalogue. If a classed catalogue is needed for the Farmington plan acquisitions, then a general subject union catalogue must also be desirable. Mr. Metcalf suggested that a subject catalogue might be of more importance for current than for older material that is listed in other bibliographies.

Mr. Evans indicated his willingness, if the ARL so recommended, to make a copy of each card sent in under the Farmington plan and to hold the copies in a dead file as material for a future classified union catalogue. Mr. Brown suggested that each library might as well be required to send in two cards, but Mr. David questioned the desirability of making a second card now for storage; the cards could be duplicated just as easily whenever a final policy decision is made. Mr. Evans agreed; his point was that the question of a general classified union catalogue should be taken up on its merits and apart from the Farmington plan.

The Chairman asked the group to express its opinion on the desirability of a subject union catalogue. Mr. White favored it, but doubted that it should be given a top priority. Mr. Shaw wondered if a subject catalogue prepared in any one place could be generally satisfactory and could cover special subjects adequately. The Engineering Societies Library, for example, might make as many as sixty subject entries for an item for which the Library of Congress would make only two or three. He doubted that there is a satisfactory basis at present for decision as to the value of a central subject catalogue. Mr. Evans said that such a catalogue could include all of the Engineering Societies' entries if cards were sent in for them. In reply to a question by Mr. Shaw, however, he agreed that it would be necessary to work these cards into a uniform subject heading scheme.

Mr. Beals suggested that, if the Farmington plan succeeds, a library specializing in any subject will eventually acquire the retrospective as well as the current literature and will therefore become the logical place for a subject record, which it should be able to prepare better than any central institution could do. Mr. Evans, agreeing, added that libraries might be asked to undertake to issue printed subject bibliographies in their fields of specialization. Mr. Beals thought it would take twenty-five years for the materialization of such proposals.

Mr. White believed it might be desirable to move toward the pub-

lication of library catalogues, such as those of the Department of Agriculture and the Army Medical Library, rather than to emphasize a classified union catalogue. Mr. Evans expressed interest in a suggestion by Mr. Fleming that specializing libraries enter into relations with indexing and abstracting journals in their fields. The Library of Congress had recently agreed to supply the *Middle East Journal* with a current bibliography.

Replying to questions on the cooperative buying program in China, Mr. Brown said that action has been postponed at present because of unsettled conditions, but there has been discussion of continuing the scheme. Experts in China may be found who will undertake to make regular shipments of books in their fields. At present it is impossible to find out what is being published in many parts of the country.

Exchange with Japan is now possible. As far as Mr. Brown had been able to learn, about three-fourths of the university stocks of publications there survived the war. General MacArthur and the Treasury Department have agreed to the resumption of exchanges and Mr. Simpson reported that the War Department has negotiated with the Smithsonian Institution, which can now accept exchange material; the only restriction is that General MacArthur's headquarters will reserve the right to delay, divert, or refuse delivery if necessary. Satisfactory machinery has not yet been set up for getting Japanese publications into this country.

Under the Trading with the Enemy Act, it is possible to get a Treasury license for making direct shipments, but the formalities are numerous. Packages can, however, be sent addressed to a library in Japan via the Supreme Command, and there are hopes that more direct channels will be made available.

Mr. Brown recalled that there had been discussion of sending a mission to Japan along the lines of the Library of Congress Mission to Germany. Mr. Clapp explained that the proposal had not yet been explored; there was some question regarding the number of libraries that would be interested in participating and whether or not their purchases would be large enough to underwrite the overhead expenses required for even a small mission of perhaps two persons, which would amount to approximately \$13,000 per year.

Mr. Brown believed a mission would be financially practicable if

it is to be a year or more before material can be obtained from Japan by other means. Scientists had informed him that some of the Japanese publications are very valuable, and the Japanese universities are eager to obtain American material and to restore exchange relations. On the other hand, if normal channels are to be open within three or six months, a mission may be needless.

Mr. Fahs wondered if the desirability of a mission were not also partially dependent on the question of how soon materials now in Washington may be made freely available. A large portion of wartime Japanese publications are in Washington, but are not yet open to scholarly use. Mr. Evans reported that the Library of Congress had been attempting to get material from Japan, but had found it difficult to send money there; moreover, the Washington Documents Center of the War and Navy Departments disregards instructions of the people in the field and keeps anything it wants or gives material intended for the Library of Congress to other agencies if it wishes. When three copies of an encyclopedia come, even though one has been specifically marked for the Library of Congress, the first may be kept by the Center, the second given to Military Intelligence, and the third to Naval Intelligence; since the Center was set up to serve the intelligence agencies of both departments, this does not seem reasonable. It has been promised, however, that the whole Washington Documents Center collection will eventually be transferred to the Library of Congress.

Mr. Brown reported that there had been many complaints because scholars were not allowed access to the collection. Mr. Evans agreed, but reported that, even after its transfer to the Library of Congress, it would probably not be opened to the public for a year or more. He remarked that there was one advantage in the arrangement—the Center has sufficient manpower to catalogue the material, while the Library of Congress does not.

Miss Ludington reported that valuable publications, especially in tropical medicine, physics, mathematics, and population studies, are being issued in India and are very hard to obtain, largely because of the poor organization of publishing there. Much of the material appears in pamphlet form and is issued by private agencies rather than commercial firms. There is great interest in exchange.

International Exchange of Documents

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

Specialization programs, it has been seen, are chiefly concerned with research materials that ought to be somewhere in the country but need not be extensively duplicated and, in many cases, will not be acquired at all if specialization has not been organized. Such a program may not require the direct participation of more than a few dozen research libraries, but some other forms of international interchange affect the acquisitions of all libraries.

Publications are acquired by gift, exchange, or purchase. Gifts will be considered here along with exchanges, from which they are not always easily distinguishable at the international level. Since exchanges must usually be confined either to duplicates or to publications issued by a library or by the institution to which it belongs, it is evident at the outset that international exchanges are of interest to fewer libraries than the commercial methods of interchange that will be considered in Memorandum VIII.

Throughout the discussion of exchanges, it may be worth while to keep in mind Bergson's observation that "*En matière d'échanges de publications, si une nation plus favorisée donne plus qu'elle ne reçoit, elle n'est cependant pas en perte, car elle répand sa pensée et son sentiment, elle étend sa personnalité, elle propage son influence.*"³⁷⁸ Universities, learned societies, and other organizations with scholarly interests are concerned to some extent with national intellectual prestige, and their publishing activities are directed toward the dissemination of results of research rather than toward making money; but Bergson's principle seems particularly applicable to the ex-

change of publications issued by governments themselves.

The documents that come to a country by exchange are preserved and circulated by libraries, but, since the arrangements for their exchange are usually made by governments and have often been regulated by international conventions or treaties, it seems appropriate to consider document exchange separately from library exchanges in general. The value of documents has been generally recognized, particularly during recent years, but it may be pointed out that, in some countries, they are relatively even more important than in the United States and cover an even wider range of subjects. Hanke has observed that governments in Latin America do more publishing than all the private firms together.³⁷⁴

Vattemare's efforts to establish exchanges were chiefly in the field of duplicates and will be considered in the next memorandum; the first important steps toward organization of current document exchanges appear to have been taken during the last half of the nineteenth century. In 1867 fourteen European princes signed an agreement for exchange between museums of reproductions of works of art. National commissions were to be formed, and the Belgian commission, appointed in 1871, was given a considerably broader field of activity than would have been necessary under the princes' agreement. It prepared to list all documents (as well as other serials) and to negotiate exchanges.³⁷⁵

The year 1867 was also an historic date in American document exchange, since a joint resolution of Congress then first provided that fifty copies of documents be made available for exchange through the Smithsonian Institution. Regular shipments did not begin until six years later.³⁷⁶

The next development came when an International Geographical Congress, meeting at Paris in 1875, proposed that each nation establish a central bureau to collect all maps and other geographical publications published at state expense and exchange at least one copy of each with other nations entering the agreement. The French commissioner prepared an agreement for the listing and exchange of all documents by a national bureau, with the provision that special bilateral agreements could provide for exchange of more than one copy. A French bureau was established; by the end of 1879 it had entered into relations with twenty-one countries.³⁷⁷

Conferences were held at Brussels to discuss exchanges in 1877, 1880, and 1883³⁷⁸ before the convention of 1886 was finally concluded. It calls for the establishment by each nation of an exchange bureau, the exchange of all official documents and works executed by order and at the expense of the government, the publication of an annual list of items available, arrangements between the bureaux as to the number of copies to be exchanged, direct transmission from bureau to bureau and use of standard forms, and payment by the shipper of packing and transportation costs. A second, supplementary convention provides for the immediate transmission of official journals and of parliamentary annals and documents.³⁷⁹

The Brussels convention was signed in 1886 and ratified with reasonable promptness by the United States, Belgium, Brazil, Italy, Portugal, Serbia, Spain, and Switzerland. Uruguay, Argentina, and Paraguay followed in 1889, but there were no further ratifications until after the first world war, when Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, the Dominican Republic, Latvia, Danzig, and China entered the agreement. This, of course, does not mean that no other nations have exchanged documents; Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Liberia, Holland, Peru, Russia, and two Australian states had established bureaux by 1910,³⁸⁰ and the United States, by 1926, could report document exchange relations with 101 governments.³⁸¹

It cannot be said that the Brussels convention has been highly successful. Critics have called attention to the slowness in transmission of publications, the fact that the annual lists are not integrated with bibliographies, and the absence of any international body to coordinate the project. Some nations were undoubtedly discouraged from adhering by the requirement that all publications be exchanged,³⁸² particularly since government subventions are sometimes given to very expensive works,³⁸³ and there may be good reasons for reluctance to establish a new administrative bureau as required by the convention.³⁸⁴

The IIIC attempted to encourage ratifications of the convention,³⁸⁵ but, as can be judged from the list of postwar signatories, it was not very successful. A Committee of Experts recommended establishment of an international commission to report annually on the working of the national bureaux, called attention to the need

for better financial support of the bureaux, and recommended restricted adherence to the Brussels convention. Only Egypt and Morocco accepted the latter recommendation, and a new agreement was prepared, providing for exchange of current national bibliographies, publication of information on acquisitions of scholarly libraries, listing and exchange of scientific publications, establishment of centres to list exchange materials, and the publication and forwarding to the IIIC of reports on exchanges. Only Brazil, Cuba, Hungary, Monaco, Rumania, and El Salvador had indicated their approval of this by 1926.³⁸⁶

The Prague congress passed resolutions favorable to this agreement as well as to the Brussels convention and to bilateral treaties and recommended that a new agreement be prepared by the IIIC.³⁸⁷ The latter recommendation was repeated by the Rome congress of 1929.³⁸⁸ It has been suggested that governments agree only to the establishment of bureaux like the Smithsonian Institution for transmission of exchanges and to publication of annual statistics or reports.³⁸⁹ The CIB had a Committee of Parliamentary Libraries which considered some problems of document exchange, including recommendations approved at Madrid that summaries of legislative action be published in French and that official agencies for listing and sales of documents be established.³⁹⁰ In 1939 the IIIC recommended a meeting of representatives of national bureaux to draft a new agreement.³⁹¹

The Buenos Aires convention of 1936 provided for exchange of two copies of all documents. This was ratified by the United States in 1939 with a reservation providing for modification by bilateral arrangements as to the number of copies to be exchanged.³⁹² A special agreement with Mexico had been concluded in 1937.

Bilateral agreements have been advocated as more satisfactory than general conventions,³⁹³ and document exchanges were provided for in a number of cultural relations treaties, including those between Brazil and Argentina,³⁹⁴ Austria and Hungary,³⁹⁵ Germany and Hungary,³⁹⁶ and Sweden and Czechoslovakia.³⁹⁷

It has been seen that national centres of one sort or another have an important place in document exchange agreements. Listing available publications is one of their essential activities, and it will be observed, in connection with general exchanges, that they have often been given responsibility for handling nondocumentary material and

for serving as national exchange information centres or clearing-houses. National institutes of bibliography³⁹⁸ or national libraries³⁹⁹ have been suggested as appropriate agencies to handle these activities. An international centre to which all documents would be sent for distribution has also been suggested.⁴⁰⁰

The establishment by Belgium of the first international exchange bureau in Europe has been mentioned. This service sent 79,681 and received 135,090 official publications in 1929.⁴⁰¹ Holland has an active service connected with the Royal Library,⁴⁰² while the Hungarian organization, founded in 1923, developed into a national library information bureau.⁴⁰³ The Library of Congress, which was provided with 125 copies of documents by an act of 1925, has, as noted, complete or partial exchanges with more than one hundred governments.⁴⁰⁴ Transmission, of course, is through the Smithsonian Institution, which, according to its annual report for the year 1937/38, sent 157,000 pounds of American documents abroad and received more than 60,000 pounds of foreign documents.

The librarians of this country have for years advocated improved listing and distribution of American government documents; it may be sufficient here to call attention to the annual volumes published by the ALA in 1933 and several later years, and to one of the most recent of many articles on the subject by Wilcox.⁴⁰⁵ Internationally, selective, annotated lists of documents have been proposed to meet Latin American needs.⁴⁰⁶ American libraries abroad serve as document centres to some extent,⁴⁰⁷ and it is possible that a plan for public sales of documents may be developed with their assistance.

State and local documents should not be ignored internationally. The practice of document exchange between states began in 1811,⁴⁰⁸ and it is interesting to note that in 1933 North Carolina offered its state university twenty-five copies of all state publications for exchange. A later amendment extended the right to Duke University.⁴⁰⁹

International document exchange agreements have made no provision for the acquisition of documents by nongovernmental libraries. Can arrangements be made for some of these libraries to receive foreign documents on exchange? A system of specialization in foreign documents, probably on a regional basis, seems to be in the public interest. Could not the Library of Congress be enabled to dispose

of as many copies of American documents as it can use for exchange purposes, with the understanding that, when it is able to secure multiple copies in return, it may distribute these to research libraries?

Distribution and listing ought to be improved both within this country and internationally. What effective action is possible? What is needed in the way of selective listing?

Should another international convention be drafted? Are bilateral agreements preferable? Or is it best to leave negotiations to the Library of Congress, once it has been adequately supplied with exchange copies?

The League of Nations Library is said to have been the most successful collector of documents.⁴¹⁰ What can be done now through UNESCO to see that its collections are maintained?

Many documents are published on poor paper. Should not national centres be prepared to supply libraries with microfilm copies of these?

For state and local documents, should the North Carolina system be adopted elsewhere, or should states be urged to make their publications available for distribution abroad through the national centre?

If additional copies are made available for exchange, and if documents are supplied generously to the American libraries abroad, will this insure adequate foreign distribution?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Evans reported that the Library of Congress has tried to make its document collections inclusive and has gone beyond treaty obligations, resorting both to executive agreements and to special arrangements with issuing agencies. He believed that the major question concerned publications of foreign governments that ought to be in other American libraries. Many documents are received in more than one copy, but the Library of Congress has no pattern for their distribution and would like to see one developed.

In reply to questions, he added that the Library of Congress would be able to allocate and distribute duplicate documents by subject in accordance with the Farmington plan. Not all foreign documents, of

course, are received in even a single copy, but a determined effort should result in acquisition of many of them in duplicate.

Mr. White wondered if one copy in Washington and a second somewhere else in the country would be sufficient. Mr. Metcalf believed that it would at least enable libraries to collect more selectively. There were questions as to whether the second set should be divided among libraries by subject or by country. Mr. Fleming recommended the former course, but Mr. Van Male thought a subject division would be very difficult, though, if a third set could be obtained, one might be divided by subject and one by country. Mr. David suspected that division by country would result in accumulations of very dead material.

Mr. Evans doubted that either method is practicable *in toto*. A series of press releases, for example, could not be divided up by the subjects covered in the releases. But all publications of a Department of Public Health could well go to a medical library, and so on, regardless of the subject of the individual document. Mr. Fleming agreed.

Mr. White suggested the desirability of a study of the legislation, executive agreements, treaties, distribution machinery, etc., which might assist librarians of the world to gain access to documents. Mr. Evans remarked that the machinery was not uniformly successful; a treaty is only the first step in a continuing battle to acquire the material. He believed, however, that the group might be interested in going beyond a second set, and considering the problem of how to get as many copies as are needed by the research libraries of the country.

In reply to a question as to whether or not present treaty arrangements are adequate for the job that ought to be done, Mr. Evans said they are not, but it may be preferable for the additional material to come by exchange instead of by treaty. Mr. Clapp explained that at present there are available for international exchange 150 copies of all nonconfidential United States documents, with few exceptions. These are depository sets. Mr. Shaw pointed out that each agency of the government also has exchange arrangements of its own, and that processed publications are not available through the Library of Congress.

In general, Mr. Clapp reported, the Library of Congress has aimed

at exchanging one complete deposit set of United States public documents for one complete set of each foreign government's documents. The agreements, however, can be changed to provide for additional copies. The problem of distribution would remain after such copies arrived here; money would be required to sort and distribute them. The library, unable to divert from more pressing work the manpower that would have been required to sort and exchange duplicate documents within the country, sometimes has thrown them away.

Questions were asked regarding the functions of the Smithsonian Institution, but the reply was that it acts merely as a transmission agency and has nothing to do with subsequent distribution or allocation.

Mr. White moved that the group suggest that representatives of the ARL and of the ALA Board on Resources confer with the Librarian of Congress and seek to prepare a plan for bringing to this country several copies of foreign documents for distribution in accordance with whatever subject or geographical arrangement seems suitable to the three parties, and that these representatives be asked to bear in mind the fact that the present may be a favorable time for securing desirable alterations in treaty arrangements.

Mr. Heindel asked if Mr. Evans believed that the treaty arrangements were working sufficiently well to make it worth while to try to increase to two or three the number of sets specified in the next executive agreements that are negotiated. Mr. Evans said he had assumed that this country might wish to offer something other than a second set of United States documents in some cases; Iraq, for example, may be saturated with a single copy of some American documents, but might welcome copies of some other publications from this country.

Discussion made it clear that the United States sends many more documents to most countries than it receives from them. Mr. Evans thought there should be no insistence on pound-for-pound matching, even though one set of American publications may be greater in volume than two of the other nation's. With regard to distribution, it was suggested that a foreign document expediting project similar to the existing domestic scheme might be set up. Mr. Evans pointed out that additional costs would be involved, because something would have to be sent in exchange for the foreign documents.

Mr. Peiss wondered if the benefiting American institutions would be willing to provide certain nondocumentary materials for exchange. Mr. Vosper believed that they would, and reported that at California there are many state documents on hand, some of which appear to interest foreign countries.

Mr. Clapp added that American university publications are not, in many cases, wanted by the publishers of foreign documents, but an expediter might be able to arrange transfers whereby universities of the country in question would benefit. In any case, he hoped it would be assumed in discussions with the Librarian of Congress that the cost will have to be taken care of by American libraries—both the cost of distribution and the payment for additional copies of documents.

Mr. Bernardo reported that the Philippines formerly received three depository sets of American documents, but, as a result of the granting of independence, these had been stopped and no exchange treaty had yet been concluded. Mr. Evans reported that a set was being held for the Philippines. Mr. Shaw complained that the Philippine government had recently decided to require postage on shipments of documents, instead of making a postal agreement similar to those between the United States and Latin American nations. Mr. Bernardo hoped that a coordinating agency for exchanges would be set up in the Philippines to take care of the needs of all American libraries.

Mr. White's motion (page 79) was unanimously passed.

Miss Ludington thought it would be very helpful if each United States library abroad could be informed of the distribution of American documents in the country it serves—not the complete set that goes to the central depository, but the series sent to separate government agencies and other libraries. Many inquiries could be answered by referring people to the nearest set of the publications in which they are interested. Moreover, when a library began to receive requests because of this procedure, it might be encouraged to make its holdings more accessible. Mr. Clapp asked if lists of American university exchanges would not also be useful, but Miss Ludington was chiefly interested in government publications.

Mr. Shaw reported that for some years American embassies had been supplied with such information by the Department of Agricul-

ture, which has been trying to have them check its mailing lists and delete dead institutions. The checking has been done in twenty-six countries; all procurement officers also have copies of the lists. Mr. Heindel believed that, in some cases, the lists had not found their way into the right hands in the field. He hoped that the Department of State would assemble a foreign mailing list for all government agencies.

He also believed that some progress is being made in designation of proper sales agents overseas for United States documents. Libraries are among the natural agents. The Government Printing Office, like the American book trade, has not been particularly export conscious in the past, but there is general agreement now that documents ought to be sold abroad.

Since some agencies are not following the procedure of the Department of Agriculture now, Mr. Shaw suggested that the conference recommend that all foreign mailing lists for documents be made available to the State Department and to the scholarly institutions of this country. Perhaps a central exchange record could be maintained at the Library of Congress, and foreign service personnel could be supplied with copies of all lists. The Superintendent of Documents now keeps a card record for printed publications only. Mr. Heindel supported the recommendation.

In response to questions, Mr. Heindel added that the American information libraries abroad are not official document depositories, and that their designation would require legislation which has not yet been requested. Designation as partial depositories would be desirable. He believed, also, that American state documents are having an increasing significance overseas, but the information libraries find it difficult to acquire some of them.

Mr. Evans said that the major difficulty in the document situation has been that no agency has been responsible for seeing to it that they are widely and well distributed. The Superintendent of Documents acts merely as a clerk; the Library of Congress is chiefly interested in what it can get in return; and, until recently, the Department of State has not been concerned with the impression America makes abroad. There is some question as to whether any existing agency is competent to handle the whole problem. Mr. Heindel agreed; in his opinion, one of the weaker points in democratic education has

Exchanges Between Libraries

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

The publications exchanged by libraries fall into several distinct groups, and it ought to be kept in mind that procedures applicable to one kind of material may be unsuitable for another. Documents, which require legislative action to make copies available, if not agreements negotiated directly between governments, have already been considered. Serials issued by institutions maintaining libraries form perhaps the most important group to be considered in this memorandum, and seem to be relatively easy to handle because an agreement for their exchange, once it has been made, may continue for many years without further negotiation. Institutional monograph publications are a second group, of which theses form an important subdivision. Duplicates may also be divided into serials and monographs. Finally, something should be said of the exchange of materials that are not duplicates but may be transferred from the library that holds them to another, where they will fill a gap in a serial file or in a subject collection.

Exchanges of both institutional publications and duplicates have fairly long histories. The Bibliothèque Nationale in 1694 exchanged duplicates for new English and German books.⁴¹¹ A "Commercium Literarium" was in existence as early as 1740 between the universities of Lund, Abo, and Greifswald for exchange of academic publications. The German Akademischer Tauschverein was inaugurated in 1817 by Jena, Breslau, and Marburg. Its membership numbered eighteen by 1823, and foreign universities were included later; Uppsala, for example, joined in 1859.⁴¹² In 1832 the British government attempted

to arrange for a complete exchange with France of all books deposited under the copyright laws.⁴¹³

A few years later, Alexandre Vattemare, a professional ventriloquist, began his efforts to establish an international exchange system. He came to the United States in 1839 and secured the passage by Congress of a joint resolution providing for exchange of Library of Congress duplicates with foreign libraries. Several states, including Maine, Maryland, Louisiana, New York, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Indiana, made him their agent at one time or another. He took a large collection with him from this country to France and returned in 1847 with materials valued at \$80,000. His original plan had involved the publication of a journal listing publications offered, but this did not materialize, nor did a later plan for a central office in Paris with national branches. Vattemare arranged for the exchange of valuable materials (perhaps 2,000,000 volumes in all), but slowness, unbusinesslike methods, and high operating expenses caused his dismissal by Congress in 1852. His system seems to have left no direct descendants and, for that matter, no trace has been found of the American Library in Paris which he established.⁴¹⁴

Later nineteenth-century developments in international exchanges were closely linked with the document exchange conventions that have been described. The Smithsonian Institution, like the Belgian⁴¹⁵ and Dutch⁴¹⁶ bureaux that were founded in 1871, transmitted the publications of private institutions, and the Brussels Convention provides that bureaux of exchange shall serve "as intermediaries between the learned bodies and literary and scientific societies, etc. of the contracting states for the reception and transmission of their publications." It adds, however, that "the duty of the bureaux . . . will be confined to the free transmission of the works exchanged;" and that the bureaux will not "in any manner take the initiative to bring about the establishment of such relations."⁴¹⁷

Exchange has been described as the major source of acquisition for many German institutions,⁴¹⁸ and it seems to be equally important to some other European libraries. The number of institutions with which the University of Uppsala had exchange relations grew from 63 in 1884 to 761 in 1897, 2,000 in 1913, and 2,200 in 1929; more than 300 of these were German and nearly that many American, with French, British, Italian, and Swiss institutions following. The library

has all dissertations of the University at its disposal, plus 120 serials; by 1929 it was receiving 2,828 serials on exchange and purchasing only 785.⁴¹⁹

In the United States, Yale was reported in 1944 to have exchanges with 114 Latin American libraries,⁴²⁰ and Downs writes of one university with seven serials at its disposal which received on exchange two thousand serials valued at \$10,000.⁴²¹ Bishop has estimated that Michigan annually distributes press publications with a wholesale value of about \$2,000. Shipping expenses bring exchange costs to about \$5,000, in return for which publications with a list price totaling several times that amount are received.⁴²²

An interesting survey of its exchanges was made by the University of California library in 1932 and 1933.⁴²³ It was found that 4,025 serials valued at \$9,179 were received currently by exchange (2,806 of these were foreign, including 169 from Latin America). In addition, back sets, dissertations, miscellaneous publications, and items transmitted to other branches of the University, brought the total valuation of exchange receipts to \$23,555. The total list price of university press publications sent in return was \$24,278.⁴²⁴

The Smithsonian Institution, during the year 1937/38, sent 225,000 pounds of nongovernmental publications abroad and received 113,000 pounds for American institutions.⁴²⁵ In the California survey, however, it was discovered that only about one-fourth of the foreign titles came via Smithsonian.

The figures that have been cited give some idea of the magnitude of library exchanges and, in particular, of the achievements of a few outstanding institutions. Before considering national and international methods of encouraging exchanges, it ought to be emphasized that few American libraries could show figures comparable to those reported by California. Of 225 libraries replying to a questionnaire in 1939, only 81 reported any foreign exchanges, and relatively few indicated that publications of their university presses were at their disposal for exchange.⁴²⁶ If a press and a library are both parts of a single university, it might be argued that only book-keeping procedures are involved in the question of whether or not the library must buy from the press publications that it sends on exchange; if the library does not pay, it is receiving a hidden subsidy or supplement to its book funds. In practice, however, it is to be

suspected that development of exchange relations is greatly stimulated if press publications are made available without payment.⁴²⁷

Theses have always been an important item in European university exchanges. The French system was in operation by 1882 and was limited at that time to institutions willing to exchange seventeen copies of all their theses. By 1935, the Sorbonne, which acted as the national collecting agent for theses, distributed them to forty-four foreign libraries.⁴²⁸ A joint resolution of the German state governments in 1913 provided for exchange of theses through the ministries of education.⁴²⁹ The Franco-German agreement of 1925 provided for annual exchange of six copies of all theses, together with six copies of a complete list.⁴³⁰ This reduction in the number of theses to be exchanged necessitated their allocation, and the Rome conference recommended that distribution be centralized in all countries, in order to facilitate subject specialization in thesis collecting and consequently to reduce the number of copies required. It was also recommended that complete lists be supplied to all university libraries.⁴³¹ An international clearinghouse for theses has been suggested.⁴³²

Several proposals for revision of the Brussels convention have provided for listing materials (other than documents) that are available for exchange⁴³³ and for the encouragement of institutional exchanges. Listing was recommended by the Prague congress⁴³⁴ and desiderata lists have also been proposed.⁴³⁵ Stimulation of exchange was to have been a function of the national councils described in the proposed inter-American convention of 1930,⁴³⁶ and most of the bilateral cultural relations treaties have also indicated, usually in rather vague terms, that exchanges of scholarly publications are to be encouraged.⁴³⁷

If national exchange bureaux are to have a more active role than was contemplated for them in the Brussels convention, there are various organizations that might take over their functions. National institutes of bibliography,⁴³⁸ national bibliographical information centres,⁴³⁹ and national libraries⁴⁴⁰ have been suggested for this purpose. National subject centres are a possibility.⁴⁴¹ On the other hand, it has also been suggested that the existing exchange bureaux should become informational and organization centres,⁴⁴² or perhaps even bibliographical and interlibrary loan centres,⁴⁴³ a development which

took place in Hungary.⁴⁴⁴ Variations in practice have been numerous.

The Belgian service was reported in 1910 to have a large stock of publications on hand, and there were suggestions that it be supplied with two or three copies of each publication issued by the societies using its transmission facilities.⁴⁴⁵ Unlike the Smithsonian, however, it seems to transmit several times as many official as academic publications.⁴⁴⁶ The British Council, while it is not an exchange bureau, has arranged exchanges between British libraries and institutions in a number of other nations;⁴⁴⁷ more recently, there have been proposals that the National Central Library serve as the British agency for coordination of exchanges.⁴⁴⁸ The French service was transferred from the Ministry of Education to the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1936.⁴⁴⁹

The German *Notgemeinschaft* has been mentioned in a previous memorandum, but should be noted here because it centralized exchanges as well as purchases. Later this activity was transferred to the *Deutsche Gemeinschaft zur Erhaltung und Forderung der Forschung*, which maintained an inquiry bureau to help libraries acquire books by exchange.⁴⁵⁰ It is interesting to observe that, at the conference of German library directors which met at Stuttgart in April 1946, it was proposed that a society be established to arrange exchanges with the American mission.⁴⁵¹

Exchanges have been highly centralized in Hungary,⁴⁵² Greece,⁴⁵³ and Russia, where a Bureau of International Exchange was established in 1923.⁴⁵⁴ In Sweden institutions send out their own publications, but shipments from bureaux in other countries go to the National Academy of Sciences for distribution.⁴⁵⁵

A study of Latin American exchanges has been proposed,⁴⁵⁶ and the ALA, which has listed Latin American serials received on exchange by libraries in this country⁴⁵⁷ and published a study of the distribution of American scholarly journals south of the border,⁴⁵⁸ has assumed some of the functions of an agency for exchange coordination. Russia has seemed to be a particularly inviting field for development of exchange relations.⁴⁵⁹ Another method of developing exchanges has been suggested for the Far East, where the pairing of Chinese and American universities has been proposed.⁴⁶⁰

Suggestions for expansion of the bibliographical activities of the Pan American Union have involved its serving as an exchange

clearinghouse.⁴⁶¹ Several of the international subject organizations have interested themselves in exchanges,⁴⁶² and one of them has attempted to establish a clearinghouse for duplicates.⁴⁶³

An international list of materials available for exchange has been recommended,⁴⁶⁴ and an international centre to coordinate the work of national exchange bureaux is a possibility.⁴⁶⁵

During the past two years there has been repeated discussion of the desirability of creating some sort of clearinghouse in this country, particularly in view of specialization plans and cooperative acquisitions from Europe.⁴⁶⁶ The American Book Center, which represents American library organizations and has developed numerous foreign contacts, might, it is said, become a permanent organization for the collection of both foreign and American want lists and a clearinghouse for exchange information, constituting a noncommercial counterpart of USIBA.⁴⁶⁷ The Division of Libraries and Institutes in the State Department is concerned with exchanges,⁴⁶⁸ and the procurement officers mentioned in the memorandum on specialization are responsible for acquisition by exchange as well as by purchase.

The most recent development is the proposal for establishment of a United States Exchange Office to include representatives of non-governmental agencies as well as of the Department of State, Library of Congress, Department of Agriculture, and Army Medical Library. This Office would serve as a clearinghouse of exchange programs, collect a central file of information, list available materials, and assist international exchanges generally. Its object would be to stimulate and inform without interfering with existing agencies. It might be located at the Library of Congress and, at the beginning, might concentrate its efforts on the western hemisphere.⁴⁶⁹

The activities and proposals that have been considered thus far appear to be chiefly concerned with the exchange of institutional publications, particularly current serials, rather than with duplicates. Before turning to other recent proposals that do involve duplicates, a brief summary of earlier efforts in duplicate exchanges may be desirable.

There are various ways in which duplicates may be handled. Some writers have recommended that unlisted collections of them be shipped from library to library for checking.⁴⁷⁰ Circulation of duplicate lists has been the most common procedure. Any library can do

this independently, of course, but there have been a variety of plans for organization and centralization of listing. The German system (involving, also, extensive use of desiderata lists for periodical parts) was managed by the Ministry of Education, which maintained a master file and circulated duplicate slips. It handled 1,000 requests in 1922 and grew until, in 1937, 30,000 requests were handled and 61,666 volumes and 26,277 parts were supplied.⁴⁷¹ Relations were maintained with several American libraries.⁴⁷²

In the United States, the Medical Library Association has been operating a successful system since 1899. Lists are sent in to headquarters, which distributes consolidated lists, and libraries are given precedence in the order of their size.⁴⁷³ The Law Library Association has attempted a comparable project,⁴⁷⁴ and a Periodical Exchange Union sponsored by the ACRL began operations in 1940.⁴⁷⁵ This followed abandonment by the Wilson Company of the periodical exchange plan it had tried to set up in 1937, calling for payment of twenty-five cents for each volume exchanged through a clearing-house.⁴⁷⁶ General national clearinghouses have also been advocated for monographs.⁴⁷⁷

Another method of handling duplicates is to establish central depositories to which they can be sent, and it has been suggested that this might be done in connection with storage libraries for little-used books.⁴⁷⁸ One recent suggestion for a duplicate collection centre calls for the preparation of a central card file and for use of microfilm to reproduce lists distributed by the centre. Material not wanted in this country would be sent on to China, Latin America, or other areas with relatively inadequate resources. The cost of handling 250,000 items per year was estimated at \$20,000 initially, plus \$42,000 per year.⁴⁷⁹ There has also been a recent English proposal for a duplicate centre,⁴⁸⁰ and the accumulation of national pools of duplicates by exchange bureaux was suggested at an earlier date.⁴⁸¹

It had been hoped that publication of the *Union List of Serials* would encourage libraries to exchange fragmentary files and so increase the number of complete sets.⁴⁸² This has not taken place on a large scale, but, as Van Male has pointed out, the existence of the *ULS* plus interlibrary loan enables the user to locate and assemble a complete file although ownership of the parts is retained by different libraries.⁴⁸³

The tentative statement of the UNESCO library and bibliographical program declared that "The Inter-Allied and American Book Centers have shown the need for the permanent establishment of an International Clearing House of Publications, linked functionally with international and national library and information services." This was to be "a fully international and permanent publications clearinghouse . . . to serve as a receiving and distribution center for actual copies of books and documents." An appendix to the statement added that, while existing direct exchange arrangements should be developed, there should also be "a depository for publications received from all sources for redistribution to the libraries of member states."⁴⁸⁴ Later discussion does not appear to have been generally favorable to these proposals, and it has been suggested that, instead of a single international centre for duplicates, ABC and IABC might be developed into national or regional exchange clearinghouses. Since they distribute publications through national centres in the devastated nations, an international centre for collection and storage might be a needless intermediary.

The past and present activities of ABC and IABC belong, of course, to the discussion of rehabilitation rather than to this memorandum on exchanges. It should be noted, however, that the supplying of foreign libraries with American books by gift rather than by exchange did not begin with the war. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace sent books to Latin America as early as 1916.⁴⁸⁵ The ALA's Books for Europe Project,⁴⁸⁶ financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, and its more recent Latin American purchases with funds supplied by the Department of State⁴⁸⁷ need not be described. One future possibility, however, is that the American libraries abroad, since they are designed to be active collections of limited size, will turn their older materials over to foreign libraries.⁴⁸⁸

Contributions of this sort may, in one sense, be regarded as exchanges. Many foreign governments have in the past distributed books to American libraries. And the recent Latin American program, it may be added, has already brought returns, notably from Brazil, where the Instituto Nacional do Livro has sent 4,500 books to ninety-six American libraries.⁴⁸⁹

Finally, the possibilities of exchanging certain special classes of materials ought to be mentioned. Large-scale exchange of catalogue

cards, which has been proposed between this country and Latin America,⁴⁹⁰ seems to call for standardization of cataloguing, which has been considered elsewhere. Exchange of microfilm ought to be studied,⁴⁹¹ and the film exchange between the Library of Congress and the National Library in Peiping may be cited,⁴⁹² also an interesting proposal that new American publications be exchanged for reproductions of French books and manuscripts.⁴⁹³ A request was recently received from Russia for the exchange of preschool and school-age children's books.⁴⁹⁴

If the exchange of institutional publications is to be encouraged, perhaps the first questions that need to be asked are with regard to methods of increasing the quantity of such publications that can be placed at the disposal of libraries. Should a study be sponsored by the library organizations, the Association of American University Presses, and academic bodies such as the Association of American Universities? Procedures followed and results achieved at universities like California might be compared with those at institutions that have done little to develop exchanges.

Bishop has suggested that an annual appropriation of \$300,000 by the government would make it possible to send on exchange, both within this country and abroad, all American institutional publications of a learned or scholarly character.⁴⁹⁵ He believes that other nations would follow suit. Should a project of this sort be recommended? What are the prospects for favorable action by Congress? What organization should administer a research publication subsidy of this kind?

There have also been proposals for giving the Library of Congress funds with which to purchase *The United States Quarterly Book List* titles for exchange purposes.⁴⁹⁶ If the Library of Congress is able, in return, to secure multiple copies of some foreign publications, can a plan be worked out for their allocation to other American research libraries?

Should the Smithsonian Institution continue to act merely as a transmission agency? Is a forwarding office desirable or necessary for current serials? It will be seen in a later memorandum that there have been suggestions for franking all international exchange shipments. Would not this practice represent a saving in the long run? As it is, materials must be shipped from a library to Washington,

thence to a foreign national bureau, thence to the receiving library. This does not seem to be a genuinely economical system, and it is inevitably slow.

Is it desirable to continue the American Book Center as an exchange bureau, or will the U.S. Exchange Office meet the need? Should the first job of such a bureau be the compilation and publication of a union list of serial exchanges, showing all journals available for exchange by libraries in this country and all foreign journals received on exchange? This ought to stimulate negotiation of new exchanges within the country as well as internationally.

What more can a national bureau do toward coordination? Should it serve as a clearinghouse for new monographs, which are less amenable than serials to direct exchange agreements? Could it credit each library that supplied it with books, and distribute the monographs acquired from abroad with reference to subject specialties as well as to the exchange balance of each library?

Should it handle duplicates in the same manner? Should it serve as a domestic clearinghouse, or should it begin operations only when other agencies have determined that duplicates are not needed in this country?

How can information be obtained and published on foreign exchange centres? A new edition of the IIIC list⁴⁹⁷ seems to be wanted.

Are international agreements needed to regulate exchanges? Is an international clearinghouse or coordinating agency needed? What should UNESCO do in this field? Can it encourage establishment of exchange centres in other countries?

Are want lists practicable for serial parts? For monographs?

Is there a danger that gift programs will interfere with institutional exchanges?⁴⁹⁸ Can a policy on gifts to foreign countries be established, once the period of rehabilitation is over?

Additional questions suggested by Mr. McDiarmid: Is there a tendency to acquire material on exchange simply because it is available and seemingly inexpensive? What can be done to make exchanges more selective (except for a few very large libraries) and hence more valuable? Is some expansion of the Farmington plan, coupled with better dissemination of information about materials available, likely to reduce the volume of exchanges and yet strengthen libraries? What would be the effect of a great volume of exchanges on the book selec-

tion policies of libraries? Might it not result in libraries' acquiring the things others want them to acquire rather than those they need?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Bernardo spoke of the Hayden Memorial Library, sponsored by the University of Michigan, which is to be the liberal arts unit of the University of the Philippines Library. The plan involves exchanges, and materials needed by American libraries will be reproduced by offset. The economic and political situation in the Philippines is still confused. Mr. Brown, calling attention to the very great destruction of books that took place there, expressed the hope that American libraries would be generous.

Mr. Simpson believed that the War Department would be able to assist in the resumption of international noncommercial exchanges in the learned fields. Arrangements had already been made with the Smithsonian Institution for shipments to Germany. The agreement provides that all materials addressed to institutions or individuals no longer in existence may be distributed in Germany among all four zones by the former Prussian State Library, which has been designated as the National Exchange Institute. The Smithsonian, as indicated in the Memorandum, is limited by treaty to serving as a transmission agent and cannot make the allocations itself.

In reply to questions, Mr. Simpson indicated his belief that there would not be any considerable complications in the Russian zone. The Russians have acted with extreme correctness in library matters. The American authorities will guarantee delivery to institutions now functioning in the American zone, and the Staatsbibliothek will guarantee deliveries throughout the other zones. The War Department hopes soon to have a list of the institutions now operating in Germany.

Appreciation was expressed of the progress that has been made by the War Department, and it was agreed that Mr. Simpson be authorized to report to the Smithsonian Institution that the institutions represented at this conference were willing to have their material shipped to the occupied areas under the conditions he had mentioned.

Mr. Shaffer reported that the American Book Center has been considering what should happen to it on the termination, probably

by June 1947, of its present rehabilitation program, and there had been proposals that it act as an exchange centre for duplicates and institutional publications. A world agency of this sort, to be served by national centres, had been discussed in connection with UNESCO. Each centre might collect want lists for its own country, sort them out, and forward appropriate lists to foreign agencies; likewise, each would accept and try to fill requests from foreign centres for publications of its own country.

Mr. Milczewski reported that the ALA International Relations Office had, to some extent, acted as an exchange intermediary. The Hungarian Libraries Board, for example, had recently asked to be put in touch with libraries that had been receiving Hungarian periodicals before the war. A group of Panamanian publications had been sent to the Office for distribution. The Office has had to handle several requests of this sort because there was no other machinery to take care of them, but it is not equipped to do such work on a large scale.

Mr. Shaffer remarked that the need for a national clearinghouse had been illustrated when the United Nations called upon ABC to distribute its publications. Mr. Simpson noted that most foreign countries have some mechanism for distribution of publications not sent to specific institutions, and Mr. Shaffer, in reply to a question, stated that countries receiving books from ABC have to distribute them through a centre, but, in many cases, it had been necessary to create an agency for the purpose.

In this country there is not and never has been a distribution centre. Mr. Clapp added that the nearest approach to one is the Documents Expediter, who does not handle material from abroad but might eventually do so. The Expediter is maintained by voluntary contributions of a few libraries, but, if he receives material in excess of the needs of the libraries he represents, he turns it over to the Superintendent of Documents for further distribution to depository libraries, so certain noncontributing institutions benefit to some extent from his work.

Mr. Downs believed that a major need was for a list of materials available for exchange. There had been an American list (Terry, Juanita: *List of College and University Publications Available as Exchanges*, Louisiana State University, 1939), but nothing of the

sort had been compiled for foreign journals and other publications. Exchange would be greatly facilitated if the information were available. Mr. Hintz wondered if information on the availability of each title for exchange might not be incorporated in the list of serials that had been discussed (pages 14-15, 30). Messrs. Downs and Evans agreed.

Mr. Evans thought that the need for a coordinating agency in this country had been proved by the functions forced upon the International Relations Office and ABC. He was inclined to start with the assumption that it could not be financed by charity, and that perhaps people ought to pay for what they get. Mr. Milczewski pointed out that there were two distinct problems—payment for materials cleared through the agency and payment for services, such as putting two institutions in contact with one another. It might be difficult to devise a scheme of payment for services of the latter sort.

Miss Ludington believed that exchanges arranged directly between librarians add more to general cultural understanding than exchanges operated through an agency. Correspondence over a long period of years with foreign librarians is salutary and personal friendships are worth while. Mr. Evans wondered if it would be wise to establish personal contacts with all the publishers in New York, or if the contents of their books were the important thing. Miss Ludington maintained that personal relationships between librarians were a different matter, and that it meant something, though one might never have seen him, to know the name of one's opposite number, a librarian of some far-distant place, through exchange of correspondence.

Mr. Simpson added that, as in the case of documents, the volume of publications going abroad is going to exceed the receipts, and it would be desirable to have the dealings on some basis other than piece-for-piece exchange.

Mr. Heindel referred to the proposal for an international exchange office as reported in the Memorandum (page 88). Mr. Evans replied that the Memorandum contained some confidential information involving a budget not yet submitted to Congress, but he was willing to talk about it. The important question concerns who is to coordinate nongovernmental exchanges between learned institutions. This may not be a proper governmental activity, and he hoped that the conference would consider what arrangements ought to be made—

governmental, nongovernmental, or a mixture of both—for high policy planning in the field of exchanges.

Mr. Shaffer believed that, for current publications, the need is for information on what is available, with stimulation of exchanges, possibly by means of subsidies. For non-title-for-title exchanges and for duplicates—of which ABC had been able to assemble more than two million pieces in about a year and a quarter—a different technique is indicated.

Mr. Metcalf called attention to Mr. Bishop's suggestion, as reported in the Memorandum (page 91), for an annual governmental appropriation of \$300,000 to subsidize institutional exchanges. In response to questions, Mr. Williams said it was his understanding that the idea was to enable university presses to send their publications on exchange to any institution that needed them. Mr. Shaw recalled that when the Bloom bill was before Congress it has been estimated that it would cost more than \$300,000 to send everything that might be wanted. Mr. Williams pointed out that Mr. Bishop had been considering only university and academic publications, most of which are already being sent on exchange to some extent. Mr. Shaw was still not sure that, if costs of both acquisition and distribution were included, the sum would be sufficient, and Mr. Milczewski shared his doubt. Mr. Clapp, however, reported that it had been estimated that, for \$300,000, forty sets of *The United States Quarterly Book List* titles (numbering from six hundred to a thousand per year) could be distributed.

Mr. Heindel doubted that government funds would be forthcoming for the Bishop proposal. He hoped it would be possible to encourage the learned and academic organizations to improve their export procedures and learn how to sell their publications overseas. It might help if they would form a trade organization and get foreign agents. Mr. Evans agreed that money would probably not be appropriated for the plan as stated but thought Congress might help to some extent in subsidizing an operation financed for the most part by the research libraries that would benefit from it.

Mr. Metcalf noted that there has been talk for several years of a study of exchanges. One proposal had been to send someone to visit Latin America, find out what was available for exchange there, and report to American libraries. Mr. Evans remarked that a good deal

could be learned from study of the Library of Congress files, which contain much unused information.

Mr. Clapp believed that the basic need is information on what is available. Worth-while publications, to generalize, will not come by letting someone else arrange an exchange. It is necessary to find out what one wants and go after it. If present lists are insufficient, librarians should determine what the next thing is that they need, and the next thing is probably a better list, rather than a bureau to do the work for them.

Mr. Peiss wondered how many libraries in this country are interested in obtaining French society publications on exchange and have written to the societies listed in the compilation that appeared shortly before the war (Caron, Pierre: *Répertoire des Sociétés Françaises de Sciences Philosophiques, Historiques, Philologiques, et Juridiques*). Messrs. Evans and Clapp called attention to the recent Library of Congress list of Latin American periodicals and to the Library of Congress Mission list of publications of the American zone of Germany. Checking such lists, it was emphasized, is something libraries must do for themselves.

Mr. Evans moved that continuation of the ABC be endorsed, at least until some better means of coordinating exchanges is found. In reply to questions regarding the likelihood of its continuation, Mr. Shaffer expressed the opinion that, if UNESCO comes into the picture, the chances are fair. He believed that it would have to be privately financed; UNESCO, if it supplied funds for any such activities, would do so only in countries where the need was greatest. ABC funds, consequently, would have to come from a number of technical and scientific agencies. If UNESCO does not undertake to act as a global regulator of exchange agencies, there is still some chance that ABC will go ahead. Mr. Heindel believed that, if it were continued as an exchange office, the possibilities of government support might be better than they had been in the past.

Mr. Evans' motion was unanimously approved.

If ABC continues and flourishes, Mr. Evans explained, there will still be a need for coordination of federal exchanges through an intergovernmental agency, which would be in a position to cooperate with an outside organization such as ABC.

With reference to the question in the Memorandum (page 91)

regarding continuation of the Smithsonian Institution as a transmission agency, Mr. Peiss thought that a government agency is particularly useful at present while there are many difficult transportation problems. Mr. Evans remarked that no one is required to use Smithsonian, and Mr. Clapp said that changes might be desirable but loss of the \$40,000 subsidy involved should not be risked.

Mr. Hintz asked if there were any prospect of speeding up transmission via Smithsonian. Mr. Clapp explained that there have been unusual delays because of the war but that, even in normal times, the procedure is to hold material in Washington until a freight shipment accumulates. The shipments go through United States dispatch agents at an outgoing port, and arrangements are made with the agent for shipment via a particular boat before the material is sent from Washington. In all, several months must pass before a publication reaches its destination. There have been attempts to persuade the Institution to use faster methods, but the \$40,000 appropriation normally covers only ocean shipment expenses. Perhaps the time has come to ask the Institution to represent to Congress in its next budget that it ought to have facilities for sending at least a certain percentage of material by post and even by air freight.

Mr. Flynn agreed that something of this sort is badly needed. In the natural sciences, research plans in a single related group of problems may involve budgets running into the millions, and a delay of six months can be extremely serious. The cost of speedier transmission would be trivial in comparison with the savings resulting from getting needed information quickly.

Mr. Evans doubted that the shipping clerks at the Smithsonian Institution had ever heard a discussion of this kind; he thought that a resolution from this conference might help to get additional appropriations from Congress. Mr. Clapp, however, reported that there had been some resistance to even the \$40,000 appropriation, so there might be difficulty in getting it increased. He wondered if, in the face of a situation such as Mr. Flynn had mentioned, bulk might not be reduced by means of microfilm. Also, the next few months might bring the costs of air freight down low enough to make its use possible even under the present appropriation.

Mr. Shaw pointed out that the Memorandum had suggested that it might be better to obtain franking privileges than to send every-

thing to Washington for reshipment. He suggested that it should be possible to determine the difference in costs between delivery of a parcel via Smithsonian and sending it at the government rate under frank. The former cost should, of course, include the expense of the Smithsonian staff, packing, etc. If it could be demonstrated that direct shipment would save a good deal of time without greatly increasing costs, a franking system might be approved. Mr. Williams, in reply to questions, said he knew of no figures on comparative costs.

Mr. Evans remarked that Congress had recently required all agencies to pay for the franking privilege; under the plan suggested, each agency would have to go and ask Congress for the additional postage under its own budget. Mr. Clapp suggested, however, that the Smithsonian Institution might issue certain franks and charge them against its budget of \$40,000; some of these might be allotted to the University of California, for example. Mr. Evans agreed that, if this could not be done now, it could be arranged by changing the wording of the appropriation.

Mr. Flynn explained that his own concern was less with delays in outgoing shipments than with receipts from abroad. Mr. Fleming added that recipients of American publications are very unhappy about the delays. Before the war, institutions in Chile and Argentina had asked Columbia University to take publications it was sending them to the Chilean or Argentine consul general in New York for transmission, rather than ship them via Smithsonian, because the delay was so great that by the time the publications arrived they had lost much of their value.

Mr. Evans maintained that the situation was partially to be blamed on librarians because they had not told the Institution of the need for speed or gone to Congress and supported its budget estimates. A considerable increase in speed should be possible under the present setup, and the first effort should be toward accomplishing that.

International Commercial Exchanges

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

It is to be hoped that library exchanges will increase, but there seems little likelihood that they will soon equal purchases as a source of acquisition, even for libraries of universities with large presses. It is obvious that commercial channels must supply nearly all foreign materials needed by the more numerous institutions that have little to exchange. For popular libraries—and for cultural interchanges not effected through libraries—there must be importation or republication and, except in the case of books written in English, translation.

Librarians, consequently, are interested in the international commercial transactions of publishers and book dealers, since these facilitate library acquisitions and further the general cultural relations program which is an objective of UNESCO. An attempt will be made here to describe what has been done to stimulate international commerce in publications and to suggest a few additional steps that might be taken without altering laws and regulations now in force. Consideration of some of the major barriers to such transactions—copyright difficulties, postal rates, and tariffs—will be left to the next memorandum.

Translations seem to have been a favorite field for efforts at improving international cultural relations in the past. The IIIC published a series of opinions on the subject,⁴⁹⁹ and the encouragement or promotion of translations, in rather general terms, was favored by the West Baden conference.⁵⁰⁰ This was also a subject mentioned in the Hungarian-Polish,⁵⁰¹ Rumanian-Polish,⁵⁰² Polish-Swedish,⁵⁰³ Swedish-Czechoslovakian,⁵⁰⁴ and Bulgarian-Czechoslovakian⁵⁰⁵ agree-

ments concluded between 1934 and 1936. A mixed commission was, in most cases, to be appointed and given responsibilities for working out a translation program. Another development in 1936 was the adoption by the International Publishers Congress of a resolution urging that translation rights be exempted from special imposts. The Congress also declared that, in the case of unknown authors, low payments plus a royalty for subsequent editions were desirable in order to encourage the publication of translations.⁵⁰⁶

Lists of works recommended for translation have often been favored. The selective national lists sponsored by the IIIC were intended to be useful in this regard,⁵⁰⁷ and the exchange of lists of books suggested for translation was provided in the cultural relations conventions between Bulgaria and Poland,⁵⁰⁸ Poland and Yugoslavia,⁵⁰⁹ Italy and Hungary,⁵¹⁰ Austria and Hungary,⁵¹¹ and Germany and Hungary.⁵¹² It was proposed in 1933 that each national trade list regularly devote a certain amount of space to the current book production of other countries.⁵¹³

The Rome conference recommended bibliographies of books that had been translated,⁵¹⁴ and such lists have also figured in the ALA program for relations with Latin America.⁵¹⁵ The IIIC was active in this field; in an effort to facilitate compilation of the *Index Translationum*, it recommended that translations be specially marked in national bibliographies, and that publishers adopt a policy of listing translators' names, indicating first translations, noting omissions or alterations made in the text, and indicating the title and place of publication of the original.⁵¹⁶ The IIIC also established a repertory of translators and publishers of translations.⁵¹⁷ Lists of translators have been compiled in Germany⁵¹⁸ and in England.⁵¹⁹

The Balkan nations in 1932 agreed that a special commission in each nation would report annually on important literary works and would choose at least one work from each of the other nations for translation and publication.⁵²⁰ At the Madrid conference it was recommended that each government institute two annual prizes for the best translation into a foreign language of one literary and one educational work.⁵²¹ The Greek government in 1931 announced a subvention of 350,000 drachmas for translations from and into Greek.⁵²²

The translation program of the U.S. Department of State began in

1941.⁵²³ By 1943, when the program was transferred from the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs to the Division of Cultural Relations, 117 translations had been contracted for. During 1943 funds were also made available to the National Library of China for translations from English and to the Chungking Embassy to pay for the translation into English of articles to be placed by the National Research Council in American journals.⁵²⁴ At this time, there were also plans for establishment of a "Book Foundation, Inc.," a nonprofit organization to include representatives of the Book Publishers Bureau, American Textbook Publishers Institute, and ALA. This was not organized, and the translation program was handled by the ADI,⁵²⁵ with the assistance of the American Council of Learned Societies. The emphasis was on scientific and medical texts.⁵²⁶ Government aid has usually been confined to payment for translation rights or purchase of a number of copies of each book. Some United States documents have been translated and distributed through diplomatic and consular offices.⁵²⁷

The Children's Library Association has proposed a special program for translation of American and English children's books and their distribution abroad as gifts to devastated countries.⁵²⁸

In 1945, Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., entered a three-year agreement for translation into Russian and printing of books to be distributed by *Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga*.⁵²⁹

Projects considered by the Cultural Institutions Round Table on September 23, 1946 included listing works recommended for translation, an annual award, scholarships for poet-translators, an international list of recommended translations, organization of a union of translators, and establishment of an International Translation Office.⁵³⁰

The ALA has been interested in the translation and publication of library literature, particularly for use in Latin America, and has issued a number of translations.⁵³¹

As early as 1908 the International Publishers Congress considered proposals for the international exchange of personnel in the publishing industry and book trade,⁵³² and resolutions were passed to encourage such exchanges in 1910⁵³³ and again in 1938.⁵³⁴

Since the American Department of State began to interest itself in the international sale of books, it has, in some cases, given financial

assistance toward visits of American publishers to foreign countries.⁵³⁵ One such visit to Latin America was made by five publishers in 1943. Their report calls attention to difficulties of shipping and credit regulations, high prices of books at the point of their origin and uncontrolled prices at their destination, fluctuating exchange rates, confusion in customs and tax regulations, inadequate personal selling, and a tendency among American publishers to overlook the international market.⁵³⁶

With regard to high prices of American books, a report by Mrs. Cunningham has suggested the use of cheaper paper and binding for export editions, preparation of translations from manuscript and use of plates and illustrations from the American edition, waiving of copyright royalties by authors, and use of holders of Latin American fellowships to do proofreading, etc. Printing in Latin America seems desirable to her in some cases.⁵³⁷

It may be pointed out that Spanish and Portuguese editions of Pocket Books have been issued⁵³⁸ and that the British in 1940 organized a Publishers Guild to issue and distribute cheap reprints of the publications of its members. In 1942 it issued for the British Council a series on Britain in nine languages. The volumes sold for one shilling each.⁵³⁹

Efforts by the British Council to increase commercial interchanges have also included publication of *British Book News*,⁵⁴⁰ processing translation requests, and making arrangements for foreign publication. It is reported that, through its efforts, thirty-one British books were published in Iceland in 1944/45, while 36,000 volumes of British publications (including 30,000 textbooks) were sold in Iran.⁵⁴¹ Whatever the contribution of the Council has been, British book exports in 1940 totaled £3,500,000, or about 20 per cent of the total volume of the British book trade, which may be compared with an estimated 2 to 4 per cent export by American publishers. The admirably efficient German Börsenverein is said to have had an export trade of \$15,000,000 per year.⁵⁴²

Establishment of the Inter-American Book Exchange in 1938 was one of the first organized efforts to facilitate and increase American book exports. The Exchange prepared lists, conducted exhibitions,⁵⁴³ and offered books for sale in Latin America at list price.⁵⁴⁴

By 1943, partially, no doubt, as a result of the Spanish civil war

and the second world war, it was possible to report that the United States was the leading source of Argentine book imports, and that seventy to eighty translations of American books were being published there annually. American publishers were making a special overseas price of eighty-five cents to one dollar per volume for fiction, but this still did not compare with prices for British "colonial" editions.⁵⁴⁵

USIBA—the United States International Book Association—was incorporated early in 1945 through the efforts of the Joint Foreign Trade Committee of the Book Publishers Bureau and the American Textbook Publishers Institute. Membership, recently reported to total 122, is open to all book publishers at one hundred dollars per year. USIBA's purpose is to see that "books of United States origin are freely and economically available throughout the world, that the best products of our technology, education, culture and entertainment are at least as fully known and as easily available abroad as the books of any other nation."⁵⁴⁶ It has worked closely with the Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture, but has not been financed by the government. It has handled orders by the government and the ALA for books to be sent abroad.

USIBA serves in Europe as a sales agent for American publishers and a clearinghouse for all orders. Its services are provided free of charge. Display centres have been established in Paris and Stockholm, but orders are handled only through regular commercial channels. A bibliographical and selection service is offered by the New York office, and inquiries regarding translation rights are cleared through the organization. Manuscripts of foreign authors are also transmitted to member publishers. A file of information on publishers throughout the world is being assembled.⁵⁴⁷ Several successful efforts have been made to secure relaxation of exchange restrictions affecting the book trade, and to obtain dollars for foreign purchasers of American books.⁵⁴⁸

About two thousand inquiries on translation rights were handled between September 1945 and September 1946. Exports for the first seven months of 1946 are said to triple the figure for 1939, and an agreement has recently been concluded with Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga to forward all American books published during the past five years.⁵⁴⁹ The *U. S. A. Book News*, designed for the Latin American

trade, began publication in January 1946, and a centre in Mexico will soon be opened by USIBA with the cooperation of the Biblioteca Benjamin Franklin, the University of Mexico, and the American Embassy. Centres are planned for Rome, Buenos Aires, and Rio de Janeiro, in addition to those in Paris, Stockholm, and Mexico City.⁵⁵⁰

USIBA has recently been instrumental in organizing an American Professional Committee which is to cooperate with a similar French body in selecting the best technical and scientific books. USIBA will assist with arrangements for publication of the titles chosen.⁵⁵¹ (The foregoing paragraphs were written, of course, before USIBA's decision on December 12, 1946 to suspend operations.)

Periodicals form a special field in the international commercial interchange of publications. Foreign language editions of the *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, and other popular magazines are well known. The Department of State is continuing publication of its Russian periodical.⁵⁵² There was a proposal in 1942 that the government subsidize the purchase by British libraries of American scientific journals, in return for a similar subsidy by the British government for American library acquisition of British journals. It was pointed out that, domestically, American publishers and readers of newspapers and magazines benefit from low postal rates that constitute an indirect subsidy amounting to \$100,000,000 annually.⁵⁵³

One international effort to encourage the diffusion of periodicals is the arrangement, sponsored by the Union Postale Universelle, whereby post offices accept subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals issued in any of the nations that have ratified the special agreement. This arrangement originated at the Lisbon convention of 1885; about twenty nations adhered originally, and a half-dozen more have done so by now.⁵⁵⁴ The Fourth Congress of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain voted in 1936 that this service be established "more or less on the basis fixed by the respective Agreement of the Universal Postal Union."⁵⁵⁵ There appears to have been no action by the United States toward taking part in this arrangement.

Between 1930 and 1938 librarians were successful to some extent in efforts to keep down the price of German periodicals.⁵⁵⁶

One further matter that may be mentioned in connection with commercial interchanges is the standardization of paper quality. The League of Nations made recommendations on this subject in 1928,⁵⁵⁷

and ASLIB at one time requested the British Publishers Association to enter an agreement with the Library Association on the use of durable paper for library books.⁵⁵⁸ The United States Bureau of Standards has made a series of studies on the permanence of commercial book papers at the request of the ALA and the National Association of Book Publishers.⁵⁵⁹

Is national or international action on paper standards needed? It is evident, at least, that if cheap-paper export editions are to be encouraged, care should be taken that library copies on good paper do not disappear.

Is special action in the periodical field needed? Should an effort be made to get American adoption of the international subscription plan?

What are USIBA's prospects for continued successful operations? Will publishers be willing to finance on a long term basis the sort of service that ought to be given? This seems to have been done in Germany; but the British Council is an agency of the Foreign Office.

Should cheap export editions be encouraged, or is it preferable, in order to avoid competition with foreign publishers, to concentrate efforts on editions and translations produced abroad?

How can foreign purchases by American libraries be facilitated, particularly in such areas as Latin America? It has been seen in a previous memorandum that procurement officers are to assist government libraries in acquisition wherever commercial channels are inadequate. Can private institutions avail themselves of these services? Should cooperative buying be organized for purchases from some foreign countries, possibly in connection with the Farmington proposal?

Should the listing of American works suggested for translation be attempted? What part should the ALA take in this? Can purchase by American libraries of translations be increased? Should UNESCO revive the *Index Translationum*? Are prizes and other stimuli needed?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Metcalf asked if anyone present could predict what is going to happen to USIBA. Mr. Simpson reported that a contract under negotiation by the War Department might help to keep that organi-

zation going longer than had been anticipated, but he added, in response to questions, that no one can say whether or not army contracts would continue.

Mr. Peiss said he judged from the little he had seen of USIBA operations in Europe that there has been a basic confusion in what people expected of the organization. Either it is a business enterprise, or something to help the government carry out a good foreign policy, or a combination of the two. No one has seemed to know. It has very little chance of success as a purely commercial venture, which means that it will probably not survive unless the government decides, as a matter of foreign policy, that it must be helped.

(The decision to dissolve USIBA was announced on December 12, 1946.)

Mr. Heindel believed that the questions on translations in the Memorandum were important. Very little about the United States has been translated into most of the languages of the world. There is no difficulty in getting a translation of a novel such as *Forever Amber*, but American histories are very scarce in other languages.

Mr. Clapp remarked that the *Index Translationum* had always been complimented, but he wondered if it had really been of any great value. Mr. Evans believed it had been a good thing and reported that it has been endorsed by the U.S. National Commission without exception.

Mr. Peiss suggested that, if revived, the *Index* ought to be on a quite selective basis; he doubted that there is any need for indicating into what languages *Forever Amber* has been translated. Mr. Milczewski thought, however, that a list of popular material is useful in a cultural cooperation program; his own office had been greatly handicapped until lists of translations from English into Spanish and Portuguese and vice versa had been assembled.

Mr. McDiarmid moved that the group express its interest in translation and recommend extension and improvement. Mr. Peiss believed that improvement of national bibliography would automatically meet most of the needs for listing of translations; the value of the *Index Translationum* would be as a selective and evaluative guide. Mr. Shaw pointed out, however, that satisfactory national bibliographies do not yet exist, and Mr. Williams added that, even with good ones, it is not always easy to locate translations.

Mr. Clapp suggested that publishers be urged to get together under the aegis of UNESCO and trade translation rights. Mr. Simpson spoke of the War Department's interest, and explained that its program is complicated by treaty restrictions such as those which prevent the distribution of Swiss books in Germany. He was doubtful, however, that the copyright laws affecting translations could be revised for the benefit of the State and War Department programs.

Mr. McDiarmid's motion was unanimously carried.

Barriers to International Interchange of Publications

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

Postal rates and tariffs can impede the movement of publications sent on interlibrary loan or exchange, and can make library acquisitions through commercial channels needlessly difficult or expensive. Copyright deposit is related to the problems of bibliography and to the building up of national libraries. Other copyright provisions affect photographic reproduction of materials for library purposes, and the absence of a generally accepted international agreement on copyright is a barrier to all cultural interchanges involving publications. Finally, the want of adequate international statistics in the field of librarianship and book production means that a factual basis for the exploration of many problems is lacking. Postal rates, tariffs, copyright, and international statistics, the four subjects to be considered in this memorandum, are, to some extent, related to all of the questions that have been considered thus far.

Postal Rates.—Some account of the postal situation as it involves interlibrary loan has already been given.⁵⁶⁰ With reference to exchanges, it may be noted that Vattemare obtained franking privileges from Congress.⁵⁶¹ The University of Uppsala has not had to pay postage on exchanges since 1885.⁵⁶² A 50 per cent reduction on rates for exchanges was recommended at the Rome conference,⁵⁶³ and the postal conventions of 1924 and 1929 authorized concession of reductions. The IIIC has recommended free postage,⁵⁶⁴ as have the IIB,⁵⁶⁵ the Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association,⁵⁶⁶ the Inter-American Conference of 1936,⁵⁶⁷ the Congreso Internacional de Archiveros, Bibliotecarios y Conservadores de Museos del Caribe,⁵⁶⁸

and the Third Mexican Congreso de Bibliotecarios.⁵⁶⁹ The Italo-Austrian⁵⁷⁰ and Italo-Hungarian⁵⁷¹ cultural relations conventions provided for examination of the possibility of revising both tariff and postal regulations. The International Congress of Publishers has recommended a 50 per cent reduction of rates on periodicals and books,⁵⁷² and there have been recent proposals in this country for franking books and periodicals internationally.⁵⁷³

One purpose of the international exchange bureaux was, of course, to facilitate the free transportation of exchanges from one country to another, but the real economy and efficiency of this method have been questioned in the memorandum on exchanges. It should be added that the Smithsonian Institution itself has franking privileges to a number of countries⁵⁷⁴ as well as within the United States, but has recently been hampered by a law prohibiting it from franking packages weighing more than four pounds.⁵⁷⁵

Special interlibrary loan and book post rates are, of course, in effect within the United States, as well as franking provisions for books for the blind.

There are four principal classes of material to be considered: interlibrary loans, library exchanges, library acquisitions through commercial channels, and books and periodicals in general. What seems to be fair in each case? There are grounds for objection to concealed governmental subsidies of the sort involved in handling postage at less than cost, but if the procedure is ever justifiable, it seems to be proper here.

Tariff.—It was said in connection with loans that there is no justification for duties⁵⁷⁶ and, in the preceding memorandum, a resolution opposing imposts on translation rights has been noted.⁵⁷⁷ In 1921, American librarians protested successfully against a threatening proposed tariff⁵⁷⁸ and secured exemption from duty for library importations as well as for all documents, learned society publications, books more than twenty years old, and books in languages other than English.⁵⁷⁹ The IIIC and the Rome conference both recommended that tariffs be removed from all library importations.⁵⁸⁰

The principles involved are not subject to the questions that may arise in the matter of postal rates, for libraries, whether or not tax-supported, are generally tax-exempt, and there seems to be no reason for the government to levy duties on their importations. It will be

seen, however, that there have been controversies in this country concerning library acquisition of foreign editions of books in English.

What can be done to secure international adoption of the principle that libraries should not pay duty on their acquisitions?

Since commercial interchanges of printed materials are also in the public interest, there are grounds for attempting to secure complete free trade in printed matter. If this seems desirable, what can be done to bring it about?

Copyright: Dépôt Légal.—It ought to be observed at the outset that there is no theoretically necessary connection between deposit and copyright and, indeed, that the United States is one of the few nations in which there is now a legal connection. Deposit has been required by law at one time or another for the benefit of libraries, as a profitable privilege for government officials, as part of the machinery of censorship, and as a means of establishing records for copyright purposes.⁵⁸¹ Librarians have been interested in it as an aid to the compilation of national bibliographies⁵⁸² and, of course, as a means of building up national libraries.⁵⁸³

Compulsory deposit antedates copyright historically, having originated in France in 1537 when François I invented it as a device for helping him to collect a royal library.⁵⁸⁴ French laws on the subject have changed repeatedly, but the institution has been maintained except for a few years during the revolution,⁵⁸⁵ and, as a result, the Bibliothèque Nationale is said to possess a more nearly complete collection of national literature than any other national library.⁵⁸⁶ It has also been reported, however, that only about one-third of all publications were being deposited before 1925, when a new law required deposit by both the printer and the publisher of every work. This has increased the effectiveness of collections to an estimated 90 per cent.⁵⁸⁷

British legal deposit also preceded copyright, having begun in 1610 when Bodley made an agreement with the Stationers' Company whereby Oxford was to receive a copy of each new book. Other institutions were granted the privilege by law from time to time until there were eleven depository libraries in 1801. At present the British Museum receives everything, while Oxford, Cambridge, the National Library of Scotland, Trinity College, and (with limitations) the National Library of Wales can demand a copy of any publication.⁵⁸⁸

It has been noted, in discussing national bibliography, that Germany lacked a nation-wide deposit law, and that the publishers themselves established a library to collect all new publications. This seems to have been highly successful, but at least one critic has described it as a makeshift substitute for legal deposit.⁵⁸⁹

American copyright began with state laws before the adoption of the Constitution, and Massachusetts in 1783 required that two copies of each publication be deposited at Harvard. The federal copyright act of 1790 provided for deposit with the Department of State, and the Library of Congress was not made a depository until 1846.⁵⁹⁰ Though deposit is instituted by law for copyright purposes, the Library of Congress has never been required to keep everything deposited. It ought to be added that a great many publications are not copyrighted and, as a consequence, do not come within the scope of the American law.⁵⁹¹ There was no penalty for failure to deposit until 1865, and a very small percentage of publications were deposited before that date.⁵⁹²

Godet reported in 1929 that sixty nations required deposit. The system is by voluntary agreement of the publishers in Switzerland, and some nations, including Belgium, buy all new books, while others reimburse publishers for expensive items.⁵⁹³ The IIIC published a summary of legal deposit laws throughout the world (1938), which indicates that almost all possible variations exist with regard to the person who must make the deposit, the time limit, penalties, and the number of copies required.⁵⁹⁴ Fifty are stipulated by the Ukraine, twenty-five of them for international exchange. Poland called for deposit in a national library and seven regional collections, and gave universities the privilege of demanding copies as under the British system.⁵⁹⁵ The Danish government apportioned deposit copies by subject among various libraries.⁵⁹⁶

It should be added that proposals have been made in the United States for establishment of state depository libraries⁵⁹⁷ or for regional deposit centres.⁵⁹⁸ Similar suggestions have been made elsewhere,⁵⁹⁹ and legal deposit in a world library has also been recommended.⁶⁰⁰ The proposals of 1832 for exchange of deposits between France and England have been mentioned in the memorandum on exchanges.⁶⁰¹

Dépôt légal has been discussed from time to time by the International Publishers Congress, which in 1896 recommended that two

copies of the ordinary edition be required and opposed deposit by printers.⁶⁰² Three years later there were objections to deposit of more than one copy and to compulsory deposit of books manufactured abroad, and a resolution was passed calling for separation of copyright from *dépôt légal*.⁶⁰³ In 1906 a resolution demanded suppression of deposit and all other formalities as prerequisites to establishment of the rights of authors, and deposit was endorsed only as a means of enriching libraries and forming a general bibliography.⁶⁰⁴

The Berlin (1908) revision of the Berne convention did, of course, eliminate deposit as a requisite to copyright protection; consequently, countries such as Spain which continued to require deposit were in the paradoxical position of failing to protect domestically their non-depositing citizens who were automatically protected in all other nations belonging to the union.⁶⁰⁵

The proposed American copyright bill of 1940, in order to comply with the Berne convention without sacrificing legal deposit—which, presumably, cannot constitutionally be required in this country except in connection with copyright—granted automatic protection but provided that failure to deposit would prevent recovery of statutory damages unless it could be proved that infringement was wilful.⁶⁰⁶

Finally, two special questions concerning deposit ought to be mentioned. The Rome conference, considering the problem of impermanent paper, recommended legislation requiring deposit of copyright copies on durable paper.⁶⁰⁷ An IIIC committee in 1932 recommended that motion pictures be made subject to the requirement of deposit.⁶⁰⁸ Both of these suggestions seem to be reasonable.

If a new copyright law is to be written, what changes, if any, are desirable in legal deposit provisions? It is evident that some changes are necessary to bring this country into the international union.

Should any effort be made to secure deposit of copies for the system of world subject libraries suggested in Memorandum II?

Could the Library of Congress consider allocating some of its second copies to libraries specializing under the Farmington proposal? An inducement of this sort might hasten adoption of the plan. What can be done by UNESCO to encourage establishment of inclusive national libraries as a basis for national bibliography and as interlibrary loan centres?

Copyright and Photographic Reproductions.—The relatively recent development of methods of photographic copying has forced libraries to confront new problems of copyright law. The present American statute makes no provision for such reproductions, and any copying might be ruled an infringement and legally penalized.

There have been suggestions that such copies be taxed for the benefit of the author,⁶⁰⁹ but any consideration of the formalities involved in such a scheme, compared with the minute sums to be collected, seems sufficient to discourage the idea. It was reported in 1933 that the Bibliothèque Nationale had adopted the policy of making a single copy, which is delivered with a printed notice that it is for the personal use of the individual requesting it. This procedure was approved by the International Committee of Intellectual Rights.⁶¹⁰ The Dutch law of 1912 provided that copyright would not be infringed by reproduction of a few copies for study or personal use, and the German law, as reported in 1934, specified that copying must be for personal use and not for profit. English law makes only indefinite provisions for fair dealing with material for purposes of private study, research, or criticism.⁶¹¹ The Publishers Congress of 1936 appeared to believe that the making of a single reproduction should be allowable.⁶¹²

In the United States, a "gentlemen's agreement," reached in 1935 between the Joint Committee on Materials for Research and the National Association of Book Publishers, recognizes the propriety of library reproductions of parts of volumes for research purposes, provided the person for whom the copy is made be notified that he is not exempt from liability, and provided the reproduction be not made for profit.⁶¹³

On the basis of this interpretation of "fair use" and as an outgrowth of discussion at an informal meeting in New York on April 13, 1940,⁶¹⁴ a statement of policy was prepared and adopted in December 1940 by both the ARL and ALA.⁶¹⁵ This provides that whole numbers or volumes of noncopyrighted material less than twenty years old (though not entitled legally to any protection) shall not be reproduced if the original is still in print. Reproduction of out-of-print copyrighted material is to be governed by the "gentlemen's agreement," and even greater care is recommended when it is a question of in-print material. Common law, it is pointed

out, prevails in the case of manuscripts, and restrictions imposed by donors must be observed; it is highly desirable that libraries acquire literary rights along with physical possession of manuscripts.

The proposed copyright bill of 1940 specifically authorized libraries to make a single copy of unpublished works for research purposes, and permitted a single copy of a published work covered by copyright and out of print, provided the library had deposited the purchase price of a copy with the Register of Copyrights and the latter had been unable, within thirty days, to obtain a copy from the owner of the copyright.⁶¹⁶ It has been seen that the Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning has recommended cautious exploration of the problem.⁶¹⁷

Questions raised by reproduction of publications from enemy countries will be mentioned in the memorandum on rehabilitation.

What provisions on reproduction ought to be embodied in a new copyright law? Does the "gentlemen's agreement"—or the ARL-ALA policy statement—need revision in the meanwhile? Can an internationally acceptable policy be agreed upon?

International Copyright.—Copyright, strictly speaking, originated in England in 1710, but privileges for printers were common from the fifteenth century on, and the Pope's excommunication in 1513 of all counterfeiters of Aldine editions might be considered a precursor of international copyright.⁶¹⁸ International legal protection of the rights of authors began in 1828, when Denmark provided for reciprocity, and agreements were reached during the next few years between Denmark and Prussia⁶¹⁹ and France and Sardinia.⁶²⁰ France in 1852 began to protect all authors regardless of reciprocity.⁶²¹

An American bill providing for international copyright failed to pass in 1837, and the story of nineteenth-century American attempts to get such legislation has been told more than once.⁶²² No protection was given to noncitizens of this country until 1891. Meanwhile, in 1887 the Berne convention had been ratified by a number of other countries.⁶²³

The present American law, adopted in 1909, is inconsistent with international agreement on copyright chiefly because it requires registration and deposit in this country of all foreign works to be protected and requires American manufacture of books in English.⁶²⁴ As the result of a controversy at the time of its adoption, it allows

library importation of foreign editions of copyrighted books in English, but this privilege has been threatened by some proposed revisions.

Special efforts have been made in the western hemisphere, but the situation with regard to protection in Latin America remains extremely complicated and unsatisfactory.⁶²⁵ Latin American conferences of 1889, 1901, 1906, and 1910 prepared agreements, and a new convention was called for at the Lima meeting of 1938.⁶²⁶

It is important to realize that, as Melcher declared in 1936, "For thirty years the efforts to revise the American law of copyright have centred around the public performance of music for profit."⁶²⁷ If publishers have little influence on proposals for revision, librarians cannot hope to take a very important role. Some of the problems to be faced are suggested by the history of the 1940 bill, which had been prepared for the American National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation by a Committee for the Study of Copyright headed by Leland. This bill was never reported out of committee.

The major groups affected by copyright revision are authors, book publishers, radio, cinema, and record manufacturers. Their demands, as of 1940, have been admirably summarized by DeWolf. Automatic copyright was supported by authors and publishers, as well as separable copyright, which was opposed by periodical publishers. Uniform treatment for all classes of material was wanted by authors, but record manufacturers wanted to continue compulsory licensing. A term of life plus a number of years was supported by authors, while cinema interests demanded a single fixed term with no renewals. Reservations on applying the Berne convention retroactively and on moral rights, oral copyright, design, and record copyright, were wanted by several groups. Publishers wanted no distinction between copyright and common-law protection, but the motion picture producers opposed this. Minimum damages were also a subject of controversy; and full protection of performance and exhibition rights both public and private was wanted by cinema interests but opposed by record manufacturers.⁶²⁸

The 1940 bill provided automatic copyright, divisible copyright, and recording of separable rights; a term of life plus fifty years; compulsory manufacture for books distributed in this country, but noncompliance to be penalized only by loss of exclusive distribution

rights; importation of up to five hundred copies allowed to permit exploration of the American market; reduction of statutory damages in some cases and exemption from liability for innocent or incidental infringement; and abrogation of compulsory licensing for records. It was opposed by radio, cinema, magazine, and record interests, and failed to get the backing of the Copyright Office.

The importance of international agreement is indicated by the statement of the Book Publishers Bureau that "It should be the purpose of all persons or bodies interested in the circulation of United States books abroad to see that our copyright laws and international agreements regarding copyright are reformed at the earliest possible moment."⁶²⁹ There are several possibilities for action. The most recent revision of the Berne convention, which was submitted to the Senate in 1934, is still officially before that body. It was passed inadvertently on April 19, 1934, but was reconsidered three days later. Its passage without corresponding new legislation has been recommended as possibly the easiest method of getting the United States into the international union.⁶³⁰ There have also been proposals for a special Anglo-American convention.⁶³¹ Efforts began in 1936 to harmonize the Berne and Pan-American agreements and, with this end in view, an Inter-American Conference on Copyright opened in Washington on June 1, 1946.⁶³² The Library Association and the American Cultural Institutions Round Table⁶³³ have urged that a new international copyright convention be convened.

It should not be forgotten that Russia has been more of an isolationist in copyright matters than the United States, and has been prevented even from reaching bilateral agreements by its insistence on treating scientific works differently from others, and on relatively short duration of protection.⁶³⁴ There are Oriental complications, too. Translations were protected for only ten years by the original 1886 convention, and Japan has argued that there should be no protection to hinder the translation of Occidental works into Oriental languages.⁶³⁵

Recent trends in copyright should also be kept in mind. They have included recognition of moral rights of the author;⁶³⁶ the institution of *droit de suite* (adopted in France, Belgium, and Czechoslovakia), which provides that artists may receive some portion of profits realized on works that increase in sale value;⁶³⁷ and adoption of a

uniform term of copyright internationally.⁶³⁸ There have also been suggestions for taxing the use of works in the public domain.⁶³⁹ Compulsory licensing, as noted above, is a controversial question; it may be added that proposals have been advanced that would subject literary works to compulsory licensing during the latter portion of the period of protection.

From the standpoint of librarians and others who are concerned with international cultural relations, the question is: What methods should be followed in order to secure adherence of the United States to an international copyright convention? It seems fair to conclude that international agreement is of greater importance than any specific point of difference with regard to the content of a new copyright law.

However, if an international convention is to be held, librarians should be prepared to state their position on such questions.

Statistics.—The Librarian of Congress, calling attention to the extremely dubious quality of the best available statistics on world book production, has called for a "thorough statistical survey" to provide "practitioners of library 'science' . . . [with] some fairly respectable quantitative hypothesis about the books . . . in existence and the amount they roughly calculate they will have to provide for."⁶⁴⁰

Collection of sound intellectual statistics was one of the original objectives of the IIB,⁶⁴¹ but the figures it was able to publish are among those of which Evans is justifiably so skeptical.⁶⁴² Uniform statistics were also the subject of the first report of the first ALA Committee on International Cooperation.⁶⁴³ The necessity for standardization as a basis for statistics was recognized at Prague,⁶⁴⁴ and a committee was appointed to work with the Institut International de Statistique. The Rome conference recommended that each government publish and distribute library directories and statistical summaries.⁶⁴⁵ Reports were presented to the conference on the statistics collected by the Union Internationale pour la Protection des Œuvres Littéraires et Artistiques, as well as on the plan that had been approved by the Institut International de Statistique at Cairo in 1927 and by the IIIC.⁶⁴⁶

Terminology and statistical reporting must, of course, be standardized within the United States if there is to be much prospect of suc-

cess for international collection of library statistics. Recent articles have called attention to limitations of the figures for American libraries that have been published, and have discussed the problems raised by materials not in book form, as well as arguments for and against counting volumes, enumerating titles, or reporting the number of linear feet occupied by a collection.⁶⁴⁷ Downs has recommended that the processed volume be the basis for statistics, that bibliographical units rather than physical volumes be counted, that separate figures be reported for professional-school libraries, but that all libraries officially a part of an institution be included in its statistics of holdings, and that separate statistics be developed for music scores, manuscripts, maps, prints, microfilm, sound recordings, and other non-volume materials.

What can be done to improve American library statistics and to encourage their collection and publication? What can be done to revive international efforts in the field of book production and library statistics? Is this a problem for UNESCO? Should book production statistics be considered at the proposed international convention of publishers?⁶⁴⁸

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. McDiarmid thought it extremely important that some means be found to assure consideration of the experience and needs of libraries when copyright revision is planned. The Council of National Library Associations, at its last meeting, had discussed methods of drawing upon the experience of special groups such as the music and theatre librarians.

Mr. Evans confessed his uncertainty as to just what the objectives of librarians are with regard to copyright. A great number of social values and interests are involved, some of which are in conflict. As the United States delegate to draft a copyright instrument with the Latin American countries, he had encountered some of these problems. Copyright in this country and in some others includes deposit provisions for enrichment of libraries, but prevailing copyright doctrine is against deposit and registration. Librarians must make up their minds on the point. The Library of Congress is now ready to say that it believes deposit and registration more important for record

purposes than for enrichment of the library; if there is strong objection to deposit and registration, the library would be willing to yield, despite the source of book supply that would be lost.

In connection with duplication, the question arises as to whose interest is to be protected—that of the authors and publishers, or that of scholarship. How far does copyright protection make possible scholarly activity; how far does the income from protected material support the publishing program which scholarship requires? The answers are not known, Mr. Evans said, but he was inclined to feel that the transcendent interest to be protected is that of the owners of copyright; research interests cannot be satisfied unless they can be reconciled with intellectual property rights.

Recalling the gentlemen's agreement by which libraries are allowed, extralegally, to make reproductions for research purposes, Mr. Metcalf wondered if the publishers would oppose incorporating similar provisions into the copyright law and, if so, how far this would go toward straightening out the matter.

Mr. Evans believed that this would be a good move, since it would provide a clear statement in an area where interests are not substantially in conflict, but where difficulties arise from the present law, which does not recognize fair use, though the courts have done so. He doubted, however, that the change would help much at the international level in promoting a freer flow of materials. Mr. Metcalf replied that, at least, it should facilitate microfilming as a substitute for international interlibrary loan, and Mr. Evans agreed. There had been a special bill introduced during the war, he added, to give the Library of Congress authority to reproduce a single copy of a publication for research purposes.

Mr. Simpson wondered if it would be possible for the conference to recognize the fact that there may be some practical distinction between copyright restrictions in so far as they apply to commercially published and circulated works on the one hand and to scholarly works on the other. The War Department is attempting, in the occupied countries, to disseminate the results of American scholarship during the war and immediate prewar years, when such information did not reach the areas in question. A small sum of money is available to pay for copyrighted material—current fiction, poetry, etc. In the *New Republic* for October 21, 1946 (CXV:520) a letter signed

by George F. Zook, T. V. Smith, Helen C. White, and Reinhold Niebuhr, had appealed to scholarly authors to waive royalty rights to translations made in implementation of this program. Mr. Simpson believed the plea would be favorably received; he did not wish to have the government attempt to deprive publishers or authors of their rights, but thought it would be found that, in the interests of international exchange, many scholars would be willing to give up royalties. He supposed it would be impossible to distinguish by law between the two groups of publications.

Mr. Williams remarked that the Russians make such a distinction between scientific and nonscientific works, but no other nation seems to have approved of the idea. Mr. Heindel pointed out that, in a treaty with China signed within the past few days, the protection of translations had been specifically excluded.

From the international standpoint, Mr. Heindel believed that international commercial exchanges and barriers were the most important of the questions to be discussed. One specific question he had in mind was how seriously the library and book world would take the suggestion for international free trade in printed matter. Treaties are being rewritten at present and the treaty structure is changing a little; there has been much discussion of freedom of information. Perhaps there is no more important topic before the conference than the statement, on page 111 of the Memorandum, that "Since commercial interchanges of printed materials are also in the public interest, there are grounds for attempting to secure complete free trade in printed matter."

It would be helpful, he added, if a study in the library field could demonstrate that real hardships are caused by barriers to information.

Mr. Clapp reported that copyright and trade restrictions were two items mentioned almost invariably in each of the reports considered by the Preparatory Commission for UNESCO, so it is to be presumed that activity relating to them will be high on UNESCO's agenda. However, in the discussions he had heard, it was not at all clear from what point of view action was to be taken. In copyright, for example, to say that something should be done does not indicate whether one wishes to reinforce or restrict the rights of authors. It appears, however, that UNESCO will back a new conference on copyright to be held at the invitation of the Belgian government during 1947.

With respect to trade barriers, the Preparatory Commission had designated a small staff to study the question and to find out just what the barriers are, where the restrictions take place, and in what directions action should be taken to reduce them. Mr. Clapp recommended that librarians participate in that work by trying, at least, to designate a study from their particular point of view to determine what restrictions should be attacked, and by maintaining contact with UNESCO to see whether or not it shares their viewpoint.

Mr. Heindel suggested that copyright might be a less vital matter than the other barriers in question. Mr. Shaw reported that, in comments by American scholars on UNESCO's program, elimination of all barriers, including copyright, fiscal, and political (with emphasis on the latter), received strong support. Freedom of access to publications may be primarily an Eastern European problem at the moment, but, before the war, there were areas where barriers had existed—it had been difficult, for example, to get rubber or quinine research material from the Dutch East Indies.

Apropos of making recommendations to UNESCO, Mr. Evans believed that the procedure should be to address communications to the United States National Commission, recommending that it take a certain position and urge the State Department to instruct the American delegates at UNESCO general conferences to take the same position. Recommendations merely directed to UNESCO would probably not be very effective. Moreover, the National Commission is receiving recommendations on these matters from many sources, and should be the clearinghouse for American opinion on them.

Mr. Clapp wondered if the subject of barriers were not one on which the library profession should make some further study before reaching a conclusion. Mr. Evans suggested that the ALA International Relations Board was a suitable agency to make such a study, and Miss Ludington agreed, provided that personnel and funds could be found.

Mr. Clapp moved that a continuing study looking toward reduction of barriers to freedom of interchange of and access to printed materials be made by an appropriate group, and that liaison be maintained by this group with other organizations working in the field, especially UNESCO, with a view to informing the American

library world. Mr. Babb seconded the motion.

Mr. Boyd objected that librarians ought to be sure already of what they wanted in connection with many of the questions involved. For example, there seemed to have been no doubt as to the desirability of incorporating the gentlemen's agreement into copyright law. At Mr. Evans' suggestion, the motion was revised to bring out this point, to express the group's support of free access by all peoples to informational materials, and to indicate its hope for reduction of tariff and currency restrictions. The motion was unanimously approved as revised.

Mr. Vosper called attention to a problem which had been discussed at the last session of the ARL, i.e., the requirement that, though their book importations are duty free, American libraries present invoices for admission to the country of shipments exceeding one hundred pounds in weight. This causes delays, increases costs of acquisition, and is a restriction that can be eliminated without legislation, since the Treasury Department has authority to remove it and has done so in some cases. At Mr. Vosper's motion, seconded by Mr. McDiarmid, it was voted that a recommendation for removal of the requirement be called to the attention of the Department of State.

Exhibits

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

Exhibits are an almost universally accepted device for stimulating both the library use and the sale of books and periodicals, and it is natural that, as a means of calling attention to printed materials that have crossed national boundaries, they should have a place in any program for international cultural relations.

Establishment of an international museum of the book was on the agenda of the IIB⁶⁴⁹ and collections were assembled in Brussels. When plans for such a museum were considered at the International Congress of Publishers in 1913, it was pointed out that Brussels, Paris, and Leipzig already had extensive collections of an international character, and the development of similar collections in other national centres seemed to be more practicable than concentration of all efforts on a single international museum.⁶⁵⁰ The same congress passed a resolution expressing its interest in the idea of establishing "edifices of civilization" in every city with more than 600,000 inhabitants. New publications from all parts of the world were to have been exhibited (but not sold) in these centres.⁶⁵¹

An international permanent exhibition in a special subject was maintained by the International Bureau of Education which by 1932 had assembled 3,500 volumes from thirty-seven countries.⁶⁵² Traveling exhibits have been advocated,⁶⁵³ and an interesting recent example is the international exhibition, representing fifteen countries, of more than 4,000 books for children and young people, which opened in Munich on July 3, 1946. This was sponsored by the Information Control Division of the Office of Military Government, and is

to travel through the American, British, and French zones.⁶⁵⁴

Books have, of course, been displayed at international expositions of various kinds, but the most ambitious world's fair devoted to the book industry and graphic arts appears to have been the 1914 exposition at Leipzig. The ALA display for this event was prepared under the direction of John Cotton Dana and included a description of all phases of library work by means of photographs and charts, and a model of a typical branch. It filled forty-three crates and boxes.⁶⁵⁵

A "Foire Internationale du Livre" was held at Florence in 1922 and was repeated in 1925, 1928, and 1932. Seventeen countries were represented in 1928, when the Istituto Italiano del Libro had been created to manage the project. It has been objected, however, that such occasions lose their *joyeuse insouciance* when they become too well organized. The birthday of Cervantes has been celebrated in Spain as an annual book day, and the observance of similar days began in Italy in 1927 and Germany in 1929; a Belgian book week was celebrated beginning in 1930; France has instituted "Journées du Livre," and book weeks of various sorts have been popular in England and the United States. Exhibits were exchanged between this country and Great Britain as a feature of "Children's Book Week" in 1944.⁶⁵⁶ The desirability of a world calendar of expositions involving books has been suggested, and it should be noted that book dealers object to direct sales by publishers during such events.⁶⁵⁷

Exhibits have been provided for in some bilateral cultural relations agreements.⁶⁵⁸ The Germans were very active exhibitors shortly after the outbreak of the second world war; during 1940 and 1941 there were extensive German exhibits at Belgrade, Pressburg, Budapest, Stockholm, Bucharest, and Madrid, while an exhibit that opened in The Hague went on to other large Dutch libraries. Each of the latter was allowed to choose ten of the books, and the remainder went as a gift to the public library of The Hague.⁶⁵⁹ Notable exhibitions in Germany during 1937 and later years were held in Berlin on Sweden and Portugal,⁶⁶⁰ and in Munich on Spain.⁶⁶¹

The British Council has sponsored exhibitions in Chile, Egypt, Mexico, Holland, Turkey, the Congo, Sweden, and Cuba.⁶⁶²

The West Baden conference produced suggestions for exchange of exhibits between the United States and Mexico,⁶⁶³ and American libraries have often exhibited books from other countries. Among the

most successful of these displays were the Chinese exhibition at Newark in 1924,⁶⁶⁴ the exhibition at Columbia University in 1925 of more than 12,000 volumes supplied by the German Börsenverein plus 3,000 that had previously been displayed at Chicago,⁶⁶⁵ and the exhibit of 1938 commemorating the tercentennial of the first Swedish settlement in America.⁶⁶⁶ The ALA sponsored an exhibition of Latin American books that was shown during 1939 and 1940 at the San Francisco and Cincinnati conferences and at nineteen libraries throughout the country.⁶⁶⁷ A little later, the Library Service Division of the U.S. Office of Education and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs sponsored a series of school exhibits including books, pamphlets, phonograph records, panels, posters, maps, and photographs, accompanied by manuals of information.⁶⁶⁸ In Washington, late in 1945, the Pan American Union exhibited books from 310 publishers and dealers in eighteen countries, including works relating to Latin America contributed by United States publishers. This display was made available on loan for showing elsewhere.⁶⁶⁹

The Library of Congress during 1946 displayed a collection of Mexican books which then toured the country for three months, and a collection of Uruguayan and Argentine books assembled under the auspices of the State Department. Forty-five thousand persons saw this collection while it was at the New York Public Library during July and August, and it will tour the country for two or three years before returning to Washington.⁶⁷⁰ During 1945 the American Institute of Graphic Arts sponsored an exhibition of British books produced during the war, and in September 1946 opened an international book illustration exhibit at the Morgan Library.⁶⁷¹

There have also been numerous exhibitions of American books in foreign countries. In 1921 the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace sponsored an Inter-American traveling library,⁶⁷² and in 1929 and 1930 it subsidized ALA exhibits at Rome and Geneva and in Spain.⁶⁷³ Milam in 1939 reported a proposal for a display that would travel through Latin America and would include a catalogue of five thousand printed cards relating to Latin American books, classified by the decimal system and supplemented with a sample dictionary catalogue, a librarian's library, a collection of pamphlets issued by American libraries to promote the reading habit, a collection of American library leaflets, posters, etc., and pictures of equipment,

of typical activities of librarians and patrons, and of buildings.⁶⁷⁴

The American publishers' exhibit of 1939 in Buenos Aires under the supervision of the American Embassy has been said to mark a new era in the history of cultural relations between the two countries. An ALA committee selected the 2,500 volumes, which were later donated to the Instituto Cultural Argentino-Norte Americano and to university libraries. The display attracted eleven thousand visitors.⁶⁷⁵

It was announced in 1941 that an American Institute of Graphic Arts exhibition was to tour Latin America for two years and then go on permanent display in one of the capitals.⁶⁷⁶ This collection was shown at the Biblioteca Benjamin Franklin in 1942.⁶⁷⁷ The Chilean Commission of Intellectual Cooperation and the Society of Writers of Chile, during the same year, sponsored a display of four hundred American books which were shown at several universities and then donated to the National Library, University of Chile, and the Chile-United States Cultural Institute.⁶⁷⁸

One hundred school books, with information about the American use of each item supplied by the Office of Education, were displayed under the auspices of the Department of State in London in 1943.⁶⁷⁹ During 1943 also, 160 books were borrowed from the American Library at Managua for display at the Tegucigalpa book fair,⁶⁸⁰ and, the following year, five traveling exhibits of American university press books, purchased through the ALA's Books for Latin America Project, went to Mexico, Uruguay, Nicaragua, Brazil, and Cuba.⁶⁸¹

In October 1945 the Office of War Information collected for display at Brussels two thousand books published in this country during the war.⁶⁸² The Oxford and Cambridge presses, which publish most American university books in Great Britain, sponsored a display of publications from seventeen American university presses early in 1946.⁶⁸³ An American display at the Mexican book fair later in the year was sponsored by the Biblioteca Benjamin Franklin,⁶⁸⁴ and a traveling exhibit has recently been sent to Guatemala by the Division of Libraries and Institutes of the Department of State.⁶⁸⁵ The cultural centres and libraries established by the Department have been active exhibitors, especially of works of art, and the library in Rome is said to be preparing a traveling collection of scientific and technical books to be circulated in areas where no other sources of American information are available.⁶⁸⁶

Exhibits have, of course, figured in the plans of organizations such as the Inter-American Book Exchange.⁶⁸⁷ The general activities of USIBA have been summarized in the preceding memorandum. It may be added here that its six centres, at Paris, Stockholm, Rome, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and Rio de Janeiro, will all feature permanent exhibits,⁶⁸⁸ and that traveling displays have also been organized. An exhibition which opened in Paris in March 1946 went to Switzerland and Belgium later,⁶⁸⁹ and a Stockholm exhibition went on to Oslo and Copenhagen.⁶⁹⁰ Plans for the Mexican centre include display of current books around a patio, a reference exhibit arranged by subject, and a room to be used for special exhibitions, collections of individual publishers, etc.⁶⁹¹ USIBA is also said to be contemplating the use of bookmobiles.⁶⁹² (USIBA, as noted in the preceding memorandum, has now been dissolved.)

A highly successful exhibition of a special nature was the ALA-University of Chicago demonstration of microphotographic equipment at the Paris exposition of 1936 and 1937.⁶⁹³ American and British librarians are collaborating on another microphotographic exhibit at Paris during November 1946.⁶⁹⁴

Photographs appear to be particularly useful in a demonstration of American library methods such as was attempted at Leipzig in 1914. Roland-Marcel has recommended displays of this sort,⁶⁹⁵ and the ALA International Relations Office recently received a set of pictures used in a display of American library practices which had been sponsored by the Soviet State Library for Foreign Literature.⁶⁹⁶

Perhaps an even more effective method is provided by the motion picture. A film on American libraries for use in China was produced in 1944 by H. C. Weng with the assistance of the Harmon Foundation and the China Section of the Division of Science, Education, and Art of the State Department.⁶⁹⁷ A list of "Library and Related Films" issued in 1941 included fifty-seven titles,⁶⁹⁸ and it seems reasonable to suggest that films be made for use in areas not reached by the "pilot demonstration" library projects that have been recommended by the Cultural Institutions Round Table.⁶⁹⁹

A number of exhibitions sponsored by American libraries abroad have been mentioned, and it should be added that all such libraries, in addition to displaying American publications, ought to serve as demonstrations of American librarianship in action.

Vattemare's lost American Library in Paris has been mentioned in the memorandum on exchanges. The first world war left behind it another, more durable American Library in Paris. The second world war, while it has made the future of this pioneer institution somewhat uncertain,⁷⁰⁰ has brought the establishment of a great number of American libraries abroad. Three, administered by the ALA under grants from the government, were established at Mexico City,⁷⁰¹ Managua,⁷⁰² and Montevideo.⁷⁰³ Since their foundation, the Department of State, as a part of its program for libraries and cultural institutes, has set up more than eighty American libraries under its direct control.⁷⁰⁴ Collections of the libraries and cultural centres include pamphlets, pictures, prints, music, records, children's books, simple works and textbooks for those learning English, reference tools, and books on the host country for the use of American tourists, as well as a general collection on American culture.⁷⁰⁵

Sir William Beveridge in 1929 called attention to the need for an American library in London,⁷⁰⁶ and the National Central Library, several years later, established a Bureau of American Bibliography with the help of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.⁷⁰⁷ The American Library in London, which finally materialized in December 1942, was established at the Embassy by the Office of War Information and was later transferred to the State Department. Its activities have been described in a number of articles.⁷⁰⁸ There have also been recent accounts of several other American libraries.⁷⁰⁹

It may be noted that the Department of State is not the only agency financing American libraries abroad, since the American Library in Stuttgart, which opened in March 1946, is under the Information Control Division of the Military Government. Other libraries have been set up by the Division in Berlin, Frankfort, Munich, and elsewhere.⁷¹⁰

The need for British libraries abroad, both as information centres and in connection with institutes, has been noted by the Library Association, which recommends control by the British Council, with Library Association representation on the Council and close cooperation between the National Central Library and the libraries abroad.⁷¹¹

There has been a decided difference of opinion as to whether the Mexico City, Managua, and Montevideo libraries should be drawn into the general pattern and placed directly under government

control or, though dependent upon the State Department for their financial support, should continue to operate under special arrangements.⁷¹²

It may also be noted that an American library much more ambitious than any of the foregoing has been proposed for Switzerland. It would have a collection of at least 200,000 volumes and would serve as a continental centre for the study of American institutions as well as for interlibrary loan, photographic reproduction, and the circulation of exhibits.⁷¹³

Plans for any further development of exhibits as a stimulus to international cultural relations involve cooperation by libraries in this country as well as continued efforts abroad.

Should a real attempt be made to organize exhibits of foreign publications and books on foreign countries in the United States? Should the larger libraries, both public and academic, be asked to devote a certain portion of their display facilities to such exhibits continuously? Twenty-five exhibits, each covering a different country or group of countries, might then be prepared, and a schedule worked out so that twenty-five large public libraries could show all twenty-five of the exhibits, each for a one- or two-week period, in the course of a year. Similar plans could be made for groups of college and university libraries, and many of the state library organizations might arrange for the circulation of exhibits through small public libraries.

Any such plan obviously calls for careful organization and adequate financial support. Is the ALA the proper agency to attempt it?

The activities of the American libraries abroad seem to make it certain that American publications will be exhibited in foreign countries much more frequently than in the past. Is this enough? What can American libraries and librarians do to help? Should the ALA prepare photographic exhibits on library methods? What can be done with films on American libraries for foreign use, particularly at foreign library conferences, educational meetings, etc.? Is a study of library exhibit methods needed? What can be done in the field of subject exhibits?

Is it time for a survey of American libraries abroad and an analysis of their experience?

Are libraries of the type proposed for Switzerland needed? If so, is there any prospect of financing them?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Heindel reported that the Department of State has no facilities for encouraging exhibits in this country; it can do little more than pass them on to the Library of Congress and other willing or reluctant participants. Representatives abroad, however, can help in negotiations, and most foreign governments are interested and would be glad to cooperate through their diplomatic establishments here. The chief difficulties seem to be in transportation and scheduling.

Before the war, Mr. Babb remarked, it had been Yale's policy to exhibit only its own books. Recently it had displayed several international exhibits, invariably on the basis of paying shipping costs to the next library, which, because of poor scheduling, usually seemed to be in California. Mr. Downs suggested that most large libraries have enough foreign material to make up their own international exhibits, but Mr. Babb pointed out that it would require a good deal of work to do so.

Mr. Shaw believed that the ALA International Relations Board ought to do more than it has done to direct a flow of material from abroad to American libraries; arranging for exhibits would be one of the few things it could do to make American libraries—particularly public libraries—feel that the ALA is deriving some benefit for its members from the Board.

Mr. Milczewski suggested that the fundamental question was whether or not libraries get enough out of exhibits to make such a program worth while. Mr. Babb believed that they do. The recent Argentine collection had created a great deal of interest; his own order department had found it helpful and had ordered a good many of the books on display.

Mr. David was inclined to skepticism, arguing that an order department ought to be able to form a good Latin American collection without looking at books in the lobby, and that professors do not get any real concept of foreign scholarship by glancing at an exhibition. In the case of rare books, he believed, the community takes pride in possession even if it cannot read them, but, when it comes to current material in foreign languages, he doubted the value of displays.

Mr. Boyd agreed that one cannot master a book by looking at its

title page, but believed that bringing together a collection of representative objects around a general theme may create a valuable impact. He could think of no important exhibition of books and manuscripts during the past ten years that had not produced worthwhile scholarly results. The recent woodcut and engraving display at the John Carter Brown Library had added to knowledge of the subject, and the Philadelphia exhibit of 1937 brought to light for the first time the proof sheets of the Constitution.

Mr. Vosper added that, while Mr. David's contention that a good order department should be able to acquire books without looking at an exhibit was theoretically true, Mr. Williams' recent study had shown that libraries were not getting them. Both libraries and scholars are to blame for the failure, and any means of bringing foreign books to the attention of both may be worth while. Mr. Downs suggested that the Farmington plan ought to help to remedy this situation, but Mr. Babb replied that it would get books into the stacks, not bring them to the attention of readers.

Mr. Shaw moved that the ALA International Relations Board be asked to arrange for exhibits of foreign materials or at least to investigate means of doing so. Mr. Babb seconded the motion, and Mr. Simpson suggested broadening it to include the study of exhibitions of American books abroad. He explained that this involves barriers to some extent; USIBA recently had a display in Switzerland which the War Department wanted to have shown in Austria, but, since American currency was blocked and no sales could be made there, USIBA, as a commercial organization, was not interested. Mr. Peiss pointed out that European countries are eager for dollar credits and will be glad to encourage sales in this country by means of exhibits.

Mr. Shaw believed that a number of agencies are already working on the question of bringing foreign materials here, but he did not oppose the amendment. His motion, as amended, was unanimously approved.

Mr. McDiarmid called attention to the recommendation in the Memorandum for a survey of the American libraries abroad. He thought these libraries were one of the most important results of American cultural cooperation and moved that the conference express its great approval and its hope that their experience would be thoroughly recorded and investigated as a basis for future activities.

An agency such as the Social Science Research Council might make such a study, he believed. Mr. Evans seconded the motion.

Mr. Simpson reported that the War Department would welcome a survey of its libraries. Referring to the Memorandum (page 129), he said that sixteen libraries had now been opened in Germany and four more would be in operation there by the end of the month. Messrs. McDiarmid and Evans agreed to changing the motion in order to include all American libraries abroad. Mr. Heindel said the State Department was eager to have something of the sort done; he thought that perhaps it would like to make its own survey before an outside agency did so. The motion was unanimously approved.

International Exchange of Personnel

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

Librarians have crossed international boundaries to attend conferences and congresses, to study in library schools or to teach in them, and to visit libraries informally or to make surveys. Temporary exchanges of positions have been arranged between librarians of different countries; others have gone to work in libraries maintained abroad by their own countries.

The organization of library conferences is perhaps the oldest method of encouraging foreign travel by librarians, and, even if one omits such regional gatherings as the Nordiske Biblioteksmøde and the Inter-American Conference on Bibliography, there have been many such events. The first and second International Library Conferences met at London in 1877 and 1897, and Congrès Bibliographiques Internationaux were held at Paris in 1878, 1888, and 1898. The IIB and its successors have sponsored International Conferences on Documentation in 1895 (Brussels), 1897 (Brussels), 1900 (Paris), 1908 (Brussels), 1910 (Brussels), 1920 (Brussels), 1928 (Cologne), 1929 (London), 1930 (Zürich), 1931 (The Hague), 1932 (Frankfort), 1933 (Brussels), 1935 (Copenhagen), and 1938 (Oxford); a World Congress of Universal Documentation was held at Paris in 1937. A Congrès International des Bibliothécaires met in Paris in 1900, and a Congrès des Bibliothécaires et des Bibliophiles met there in 1923. A Congrès International des Archivistes et des Bibliothécaires met at Brussels in 1910. The International Congress of Librarians and Bibliophiles was held at Prague in 1926, and two World Congresses of Libraries and Bibliography have been held, the

first at Rome and Venice in 1929 and the second at Madrid and Barcelona in 1935. There were also library meetings in connection with the Chicago exposition of 1893 and the St. Louis fair of 1904.

American librarians have been actively represented at many of these assemblies. They helped to organize the British Library Association in 1877. The International Federation of Library Associations grew out of the Prague meeting of 1926, the ALA's fiftieth anniversary conference at Atlantic City in 1926, which was attended by a foreign delegation, and the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the Library Association at Edinburgh in 1927. American librarians were members of the IFLA's Comité International des Bibliothèques, which met annually from 1928 through 1939, and Bishop served as president of the International Federation. American librarians were also represented on the IIIC.

British librarians attended the 1927 ALA conference in Toronto. A year later Mexico was represented at West Baden and United States delegates went to the second Mexican Library Congress.⁷¹⁴ Representation at several of these meetings was financed in part by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.⁷¹⁵ There have been numerous foreign delegates at several more recent ALA conferences.

The ALA has been represented during 1946 at a meeting of the Council of FID⁷¹⁶ and at the first postwar meeting of the CIB.⁷¹⁷ At the latter, there was discussion as to whether the next International Congress should be held in the United States or at Prague. Transportation costs make it very difficult to arrange for an American meeting. The desirability of reviving the IFLA has been generally recognized,⁷¹⁸ and there have been proposals for a regular conference of directors of large libraries.⁷¹⁹ Meetings of archivists have also been urged.⁷²⁰

Foreign students have been coming to American library schools since 1887, when a Bavarian was in attendance during the second year of the school which Dewey established at Columbia. Eight countries had been represented at the school by 1911,⁷²¹ and a table published in 1926 shows that by the time library instruction was forty years old 154 foreign students had been enrolled in fourteen American library schools. Of these, sixty-four were from Norway, fourteen from Denmark, fourteen from China, and twelve from Great Britain. Twenty-four countries had been represented.⁷²²

Foundations have made grants to a number of these students.⁷²³ The remission of the Boxer Indemnity Fund for educational purposes has helped to bring Chinese students in all fields to this country.⁷²⁴ Latin American student exchanges were provided for in the Buenos Aires convention of 1936, and, as a result, the first student exchanges sponsored by the American government began in 1940.⁷²⁵ The Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, set up January 1, 1946, coordinates exchanges of students for twenty-six government departments and bureaux.⁷²⁶ There are now two principal programs financed by the government for bringing Latin American students to this country. Under the Buenos Aires convention, to which the United States and fifteen other nations adhere, each government selects five students annually, and a United States selection committee appointed by the Secretary of State (and representing the American Council of Learned Societies, Institute of International Education, National Research Council, Social Science Research Council, etc.) selects two students from each of these groups of five—thirty students in all per year. The U.S. Office of Education acts as secretary to the selection committee.

Under the State Department cultural cooperation program, recipients of scholarships pay what they can, universities offer free tuition, and the Department provides the additional funds required. Screening of candidates is done by local selection committees, State Department missions, and the Institute of International Education, with final choice left to the universities. The funds are administered by the Institute of International Education, and 250 to 350 students are selected annually.

It has been proposed that responsibility for this second program be shifted from the State Department to the Office of Education, in conformity with the plan followed for student exchanges arranged under the Buenos Aires convention.⁷²⁷

The desirability of bringing library school students from Latin America in increasing numbers,⁷²⁸ as well as from China⁷²⁹ and India,⁷³⁰ has been stressed by recent reports.

Special problems involved in training foreign students in American universities have been considered on several occasions. Milam and Lydenberg in 1944 recommended that graduate study in the United States be provided for Latin American graduates of North American

library schools after they had worked in their own countries for two or three years, that specifications for travel or study grants be flexible enough for special cases, that at least a month of preliminary training in spoken English be assured before exchange students begin work, that selection committees be given longer and more specific notice of fellowship possibilities, that students selected be notified several months in advance, and that American universities develop closer and more continuous connections with their alumni in Latin America.⁷³¹

A conference on foreign student problems and policies was held at Chicago from April 29 to May 1, 1946. Universities were urged to accept more foreign students than ever before, and other resolutions called for expanded screening services by the Institute of International Education, broader distribution of placements, collection of information on American educational resources to assure suitable placement, and improved counsel and guidance. A survey of international centres and houses was recommended, also an annotated list of all organizations working with foreign students, and the appointment of a correlating committee of such persons and organizations. The importance of providing adequate facilities for intensive English language study was noted.⁷³²

Miss MacPherson has been making a study of foreign students in library schools for the ALA International Relations Board, and a preliminary draft of her report indicates the desirability of establishing an ALA committee to cooperate with the International Institute of Education in disseminating information, allocating students, and recommending countries to be represented. Specific activities of the committee would also include preparation of one pamphlet for the use of foreign students and another for the information of library schools, the working out of a method for evaluating and improving the English of incoming students, provision of consultation on visits to libraries, encouragement of translation into other languages of basic library tools, and compilation of bibliographies of important library tools that are already available in the principal foreign languages.

Miss MacPherson's study is based on replies to questionnaires sent to library schools and inquiries directed to their foreign alumni. A majority of the schools reported that previous library experience

is desirable for foreign students, and that dispersal of foreigners—rather than concentration in international houses or clubs—assists them. Some of the alumni suggested that a short period of work in an American library would have helped to teach them library terms. The importance of visits to libraries was stressed, and there were criticisms of the presentation of subjects in library schools as too American in viewpoint and insufficiently international. More than half of the alumni who replied recommended that the schools offer a broader program.⁷³³

Few Americans have attended foreign library schools, but the Milam-Lydenberg report points out that “The fact that United States students cannot profitably attend formal courses in the [foreign] university should not prevent our sending reasonably mature young people for experience, independent study and improvement of language.”⁷³⁴ The Fulbright bill may stimulate the movement of American students abroad.⁷³⁵

The establishment of an international library school was recommended by the Brussels conference of 1910⁷³⁶ and was considered by the IILC.⁷³⁷ Perhaps the nearest approximation of such a school was the one conducted at the American Library in Paris from 1923 to 1929, which trained 184 students during its first four years. The Vatican library school, established in 1935, was staffed by American library school graduates,⁷³⁸ and the Boone library school, the first institution of its kind in China (1920), was also of American origin.⁷³⁹ The São Paulo school has been assisted by the ALA and the Rockefeller Foundation,⁷⁴⁰ and courses have been given, with the help of American instructors, at Bogotá, Quito, and Lima. A school at Montevideo was opened in 1943.⁷⁴¹ Further encouragement and support of such schools has been recommended, both in Latin America⁷⁴² and in China.⁷⁴³ One proposal has called for a traveling course to be given in one capital after another by a North American librarian.⁷⁴⁴

Few foreign instructors in librarianship have come to this country, but grants have been made to enable a number of foreign librarians, particularly Latin Americans, to travel and visit libraries.⁷⁴⁵ A large group of Latin Americans will be brought to this country next summer. Skard has written that “The type of American assistance which would be most deeply appreciated . . . would be the grant of a number of fellowships for Norwegian librarians, to be used for

studies in the United States. . . . To Norwegian librarians who have for years lived under the isolation, strain, and fatigue of occupation such an opportunity would not only mean an unforgettable gesture of friendship, but be a real stimulant to the work of the libraries, doubly because . . . most Norwegian librarians regard the United States as their professional fatherland."⁷⁴⁶ There have been recommendations that arrangements be made for sending American librarians to work in Latin America as well as for bringing foreign library directors here.⁷⁴⁷ Prewar cultural relations efforts in Europe included exchanges of this sort.⁷⁴⁸

A number of surveys of foreign libraries have been made by Americans, notably of China, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia,⁷⁴⁹ and most recently, of the National Library of Brazil.⁷⁵⁰ The Vatican Library survey had a considerable effect on European librarianship.⁷⁵¹ Libraries of the United States were surveyed by Munthe in 1936, and his report is a valuable contribution to library literature.⁷⁵²

Library school students are usually beginners in the profession, while those who attend international conferences, receive grants for library visits, or make international surveys, are likely to be mature leaders. The exchange of library positions seems to offer librarians in the middle portions of their careers the best opportunities for foreign experience and contacts. Some international conventions have provided in general terms for exchanges of professional persons,⁷⁵³ and the Bulgarian-Polish and Polish-Yugoslav⁷⁵⁴ conventions of 1935 specifically mentioned librarians. Exchanges of this sort were recommended by Roland-Marcel⁷⁵⁵ in 1928, and by Bishop⁷⁵⁶ a year later, when the Rome congress, at his suggestion, established a permanent subcommittee to study the subject, attempt to secure financial assistance, and report from time to time.⁷⁵⁷ A few such exchanges could be listed by the committee in 1930,⁷⁵⁸ and Pafford in 1935 found references to seventy-nine recent exchanges between librarians of sixteen nations.⁷⁵⁹

Obstacles to job exchanges include language difficulties, the understaffing of many libraries, the disparity of national salary scales, and immigration restrictions. Both Pafford and Bishop have recommended that libraries make special efforts to list work that is particularly suitable for handling by foreign assistants, such as cataloguing of collections in the less common languages.⁷⁶⁰ The ALA

International Relations Office has recently encountered some of the obstacles imposed by immigration laws (or, at least, by their interpretation) in connection with a proposed exchange between this country and South Africa.

It became obvious during the war that, if American librarianship were to make the most of opportunities for international cultural relations after the end of hostilities, special efforts must be made to locate and develop adequate personnel for foreign library service. Coney made a study in 1943 of probable foreign positions and of possibilities for a training program.⁷⁶¹ A further exploration was reported by Melinat a year later,⁷⁶² and a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation made it possible for Miss Hansen to compile a foreign service roster.⁷⁶³ Some of the potential sources of foreign library positions have not materialized on the scale that seemed possible two or three years ago, but others have surpassed expectations. Indeed, if the only foreign library positions now open were those in the State Department libraries, it would still be necessary for many more American librarians than ever before to work abroad. Meanwhile, an unusual shortage of librarians has developed domestically.

This is not the place for an examination of the library recruiting problem in general or of the movement for changes in American library school curricula, but it may be worth while to recall that Melinat suggested foreign language and foreign area training for librarians, as well as library orientation courses for nonlibrarians to be given by special staffs in one or two of the regular library schools. Should anything be done along these lines?

He also suggested internship of American librarians in United States libraries abroad. Taking into account the existence of more than eighty such libraries, does not this seem a promising suggestion at present?

What can be done to increase the number of American librarians who study abroad? What can be done to encourage job exchanges? Is international agreement needed to remove the legal barriers to all kinds of professional exchanges?

What should be said regarding the activities of the committee suggested by Miss MacPherson's report? Should the library schools be persuaded to offer broader programs to foreign students? What can be done for foreign library schools?

The two principal international organizations to be considered in the field of international conferences are the IFLA and the FID. Can Latin Americans be brought into the IFLA? Is there any possibility of financing foreign attendance at an American international conference? What should be done to coordinate the activities of the two organizations?

American participation in the FID was on a relatively small scale prior to 1938 at least. Should the ALA serve as the American effective member of FID, or should the ADI be renovated for this purpose, as has been suggested?

Is it desirable to develop the Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association⁷⁶⁴ or some similar organization in this hemisphere?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Metcalf called attention to the summary in the Memorandum (page 137) of the study Miss MacPherson has been making for the ALA International Relations Board, and explained that her report would be presented to the Board as well as to the ALA Board of Education for Librarianship.

Mr. Heindel said it has been felt by many persons that the American overseas libraries, as they developed, should offer excellent opportunities for a training program in the field. Miss Ludington, he thought, would agree that there are interesting opportunities for study at almost any level of experience or status, and the overseas libraries may benefit from having fellows attached to them.

He added, in response to questions, that the State Department is finding great difficulty in filling positions. In part, this results from delays in Washington; the new foreign service bill has thrown a heavy load on foreign service, and personnel processing, in any case, is normally slow for the overseas services. There is a widespread lack of language equipment for such work.

Progress has been made in improving the status of librarians in the field. The recent advances made at the Library of Congress, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and elsewhere have helped, but the problem of improving the situation within the foreign service is somewhat different. One question is as to whether librarians should

go into the staff corps, which has the advantage of permanency, or foreign service auxiliary, which enjoys diplomatic status. One who enters the latter stays only three years and then has to decide either to try for foreign service or to return home.

Mr. Carnovsky remarked that there is certainly no difficulty in finding foreign librarians who want to come to this country, and a number of agencies are interested in bringing them, including private organizations as well as the International Bureau of Education and the U.S. Office of Education. It ought to be recognized that these persons fall into three classes—those who come only to visit and observe American practices, those who wish to spend some time in a library as an apprentice or intern, and those who want to attend school. Failure to keep the three categories distinct has resulted in serious mistakes.

Mr. Bernardo complained that the excellent plan of the State Department for giving scholarships to Filipino students has been hampered by the provision that no candidate can be accepted who worked during the Japanese occupation in a public capacity.

Mr. Heindel emphasized the fact that much of the State Department program will not come into being unless Congress, very early during its next session, passes a cultural relations bill. The program can operate only in the Western hemisphere at present, and delay in passage of a bill will hold up the budget for another full year, which means that exchange of personnel could not begin until 1949.

Mr. Milczewski called attention to the lack of planning throughout the whole field of personnel exchange. Funds to take care of a few people in one category or another have been available now and then, but there has been no clear conception of what was to be accomplished. Miss MacPherson's study was limited to students in library schools, and he wondered if a survey of the whole problem is not needed, including all three of the groups mentioned by Mr. Carnovsky. During the preceding week, Mr. Milczewski had attended a conference of the Commission for International Educational Reconstruction, which had emphasized the desirability of planning in the various fields, adequate screening, a period of orientation in this country, and special consideration of needs in relation to what each person will return to do in his own country. In response to questions, he agreed that the ALA International Relations Board is

probably the logical group to initiate a study of the sort he had in mind.

Mr. Peiss reported that, when Mr. Lydenberg had gone to Europe as a member of the Library of Congress Mission, it had been hoped that he would have an opportunity to survey some of the more general problems, such as exchange of personnel. As it turned out, the Mission was too shorthanded to allow time for such study, but numerous inquiries had come to it for reports on questions of this kind. The Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Section of the Military Government has collected data on the German library situation, but has not gone far, he thought. If someone could be sent for the specific purpose of making a study, the result might be very helpful in deciding questions of exchange and rehabilitation.

Mr. Milczewski suggested a study of the purposes, needs, and areas that might be best served by a personnel exchange program as well as of the financial support that would be required. An example of the sort of need that might be revealed is in the Near East, where librarians formerly received their training in Germany or France but must now turn to other countries for their education.

Mr. Brown urged adoption of a resolution favoring extension of personnel exchange relationships to the Eastern hemisphere, as had been provided by the so-called Bloom Bill, which, after passing in the House of Representatives, had died in the last fifteen minutes of the last session of the Senate. Mr. Clapp concurred in calling for a strong resolution on the subject.

Rehabilitation

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

The war destroyed a large quantity of library materials, disrupted library organizations and services in many countries, and prevented a great portion of the normal interchanges of both publications and personnel. As a consequence, any program for international relations that is considered today must make provision for a number of special and urgent problems of rehabilitation. But, since this work necessitates international cooperation on a large scale, and since the destruction that has occurred may offer opportunities for rebuilding on an improved plan, there is some ground for hope that programs planned now may prove more successful than their predecessors.

The first step in library rehabilitation is to get as many books and periodicals as possible to the devastated areas where they are needed. A number of international organizations are interested in efforts to do this, particularly the IFLA, FID,⁷⁶⁵ and UNESCO,⁷⁶⁶ as well as organizations in subject fields such as the International Bureau of Education.⁷⁶⁷ It was evident long before the end of the war, however, that the bulk of the materials must come from the United States and Great Britain, and that collection would be handled by groups in those countries.

It may be proper to call the Inter-Allied Book Centre a primarily British agency, in spite of its name and the fact that it includes representatives of other nations. It grew out of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, which was organized by the British Foreign Office in 1942 with the cooperation of ministries of the occupied nations, and which has had observers from China, Russia, the United

States, and the British dominions.⁷⁶⁸ Forty sets of one thousand selected books published in Great Britain since 1939 and files of three hundred serials, which had been purchased by the Library Association and the Books and Periodicals Committee of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, were turned over to the Inter-Allied Book Centre after its organization in September 1944.⁷⁶⁹

The Library Association, before the creation of the IABC, had also set up a National Book Recovery Council in 1942 to salvage useful books contributed in the paper collection campaigns. It has been reported that 136,000,000 books in all were turned in during these campaigns, of which 14,000,000 were sent to the armed forces and 2,000,000 have been set aside for libraries; 4,000 periodical titles, including 600 full sets, have also been collected. A system of priorities has been established whereby the British Museum has first claim to a copy of anything it needs, any British library that has lost a copy of a book through enemy action has second claim for a replacement copy, and British libraries that have suffered losses can also claim nonreplacement items as compensation. Damaged libraries in other countries are next in line.

Books from this source, as well as the purchases that have been mentioned, are allocated by nation, and distribution within each country is left to its national commission of librarians. The Conference of Allied Ministers of Education has assisted in setting up these commissions.⁷⁷⁰

An American policy with respect to rehabilitation as well as to a broader cultural relations program was embodied in a resolution approved in May 1944 by a group headed by MacLeish: "That it is not in the national interest of the United States, or in the international interests of world culture, to permit considerable areas of the world to exist without access to library facilities and resources."⁷⁷¹

The ALA, which had appointed a Committee on Devastated Libraries early in 1940,⁷⁷² called upon the government in 1943 to assist in assembling information on war damage, to demand restoration of looted materials, to assure the prompt reopening of libraries, to facilitate prompt allocation and distribution of journals purchased by the ALA for foreign libraries, to preserve documents for foreign library distribution after the war, to facilitate the collection, allocation, and distribution of other books for the purpose of restocking

libraries, to provide public funds and assist in allocation of private funds for rehabilitation, to promote the coordination and planning of all such activities, and to assure adequate consideration for books and libraries in any reconstruction agency.⁷⁷³

The Department of State on March 31, 1944 issued a statement of policy approving government participation in an international program for rebuilding educational and cultural facilities, including assistance in restocking of books, training of foreign students in American institutions, assistance in reestablishing essential library facilities, and assistance in the recovery and restoration of looted materials.⁷⁷⁴

An important step in the ALA's program for rehabilitation had been taken in 1941 when a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation was received for the purchase of American periodicals. By the end of 1945, more than \$319,000 had been spent on this project.⁷⁷⁵ Numerous gifts were also received. A grant was received in 1944 for the purchase of books published since 1939. The ALA has also purchased books on behalf of several foreign institutions and governments, and has attempted to keep in touch with the many efforts that have been made to collect materials for individual nations.

There have, of course, been other large-scale projects for purchase of books for devastated areas, including the "Treasure Chest" campaign of the Women's Council for Post War Europe,⁷⁷⁶ and the Social Science Research Council program under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation which was announced in 1946.⁷⁷⁷

As a result of efforts of the Joint Committee on Books for Devastated and Other Libraries, which had been formed by the Council of National Library Associations, the American Book Center was established in April 1945, following a conference in Washington on February 28, 1945 sponsored jointly by the Department of State and the Library of Congress. Operations of the ABC during its first months were financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.⁷⁷⁸ Its purpose has been to coordinate all efforts for aiding foreign libraries and to build up a stockpile of printed materials for distribution. Drives for collection of books and periodicals are still under way, but a large amount has already been shipped abroad. Some items have been sent to specific institutions, but the bulk of the collections will go to national organizations representing library interests, each of which will be responsible for distribution within its country.⁷⁷⁹

It is obvious that the ultimate success of the restocking efforts of both ABC and IABC will depend in a large measure on the effectiveness of the national distribution centres and, as White and Welsford have said, on their "statesmanship."⁷⁸⁰ Thompson has observed that an organization such as the Notgemeinschaft, which was considered in the memorandum on cooperative acquisition, could serve as a foundation stone for the reorganization of library cooperation in continental Europe. The building up of national libraries in countries which do not have such strong institutions as Germany, France, and Denmark seems desirable, as well as the development of good microreproduction services.⁷⁸¹

The State Department has also considered recommendations that surviving collections and stocks of books be regrouped in new libraries designed to meet new needs of education and public circulation, and that national agencies organize cooperative services internationally to facilitate access to their joint resources through loan and exchange.⁷⁸²

The UNESCO Preparatory Commission, likewise, has called for direction of action on rehabilitation to bring it into conformity with UNESCO's view of the long-term objectives in development of library services.⁷⁸³ There have been statements that rehabilitation should not mean mere restoration to the prewar status, that the test for each library receiving aid should be its place in the present and future library system, and that national central libraries should be favored rather than those out of the main stream of library services.⁷⁸⁴

It is not clear, however, just how much has been done to carry out recommendations of this sort or how much can be done. It has been reported from France that the Direction des Bibliothèques (under the French Ministry of Education) has surveyed the book and periodical needs of French libraries.⁷⁸⁵ In Germany, at the Stuttgart meeting of library directors, it was voted that a procurement office be established.⁷⁸⁶ Presumably in areas such as Scandinavia, which had well-organized library systems before the war, allocation will be handled effectively, but prompt action may be needed in other countries if advantage is to be taken of the opportunity that rehabilitation presents for improving library coordination nationally and internationally.

If further development of interlibrary loan, as emphasized by the

Library Association⁷⁸⁷ and by the American National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation,⁷⁸⁸ is one of the major long-term objectives to be furthered by rehabilitation, it is not by any means the only one. In connection with cooperative acquisition, it has been seen that a program of specialization and cooperation may be one means of avoiding the cultural looting of which Besterman⁷⁸⁹ and White⁷⁹⁰ have written.

Bibliography is another major question to be considered. The American National Commission has recommended that UNESCO sponsor an investigation of research organizations to determine their present status.⁷⁹¹ It may be recalled that a memorandum prepared for the ALA in 1943 called attention to the need for a study of projects of international value, such as great library catalogues, bibliographies, indexes, and other major reference works, which may need to be salvaged or aided after the end of the war. It was pointed out that American support had made a number of such undertakings possible.⁷⁹² It has also been observed, in Memorandum II, that the discontinuance of German bibliographical enterprises is one of the factors that make large-scale bibliographical planning and reconstruction an urgent question at present.

Photographic reproduction and republication are necessary for the stocking of American as well as foreign libraries. The Library Association is reported to have a Committee on Book Supply, and a memorandum issued by the LA suggests the organization of a British Publications Foundation to insure that essential materials are made available.⁷⁹³ An American committee has recently been investigating the possibilities of reproducing out-of-print Russian journals.⁷⁹⁴

It is evidently very desirable that republication be coordinated, and that British, American, and other programs avoid duplication. It is equally essential that a careful preliminary survey of world-wide library needs and of existing stocks of wartime publications be made. The FID is concerned with this question,⁷⁹⁵ but it may not be the best available organization for coordinating a program of this sort.

Seizure of copyright on all German wartime publications, as had been recommended by the ALA, was announced by the Alien Property Custodian on March 22, 1946.⁷⁹⁶ In connection with reproductions already made as well as with the future program, it may be desirable to have special provisions included in the peace treaties.

The Versailles Treaty (Article 306) provided, with regard to copyright, that "all acts done by virtue of the special measures taken during the war . . . in regard to the rights of German nationals in . . . literary or artistic property shall remain in force . . ." and that "no claim shall be made or action brought by Germany or German nationals in respect of the use . . . of any rights in . . . literary or artistic property." It was further provided that "each of the Allied and Associated powers reserves to itself the right to impose such limitations, conditions or restrictions on rights of . . . literary or artistic property . . . acquired before or during the war, or which may be subsequently acquired . . . by German nationals . . . as may be considered necessary for national defence, or in the public interest, or for assuring the fair treatment by Germany of the rights of . . . literary and artistic property held in German territory by its nationals. . . . In the event of the application of the provisions . . . by any Allied or Associated Power, there shall be paid reasonable indemnities or royalties. . . ." Finally, provisions were included to nullify any transfer of rights made with the purpose of defeating the object of the foregoing provisions.

It has been suggested that the United Nations appoint a commissioner of literary and artistic property who, when he found that any enemy-owned publication was needed by scholars and libraries, would be empowered to license reproduction, provided that the owner of the copyright were notified, that royalties at a reasonable rate were collected, and that the licensee submitted satisfactory assurances that copies would be sold at a reasonable price and would be made freely available to all persons and institutions in the United Nations who wished to purchase them.⁷⁰⁷

The fact that rehabilitation may involve special needs in the matter of personnel exchanges is suggested by the comments of Skard which were quoted in the preceding memorandum. The need for prompt revival of international organizations and planning of international conferences has also been mentioned.

Exchange of publications, it has been seen, made a vital contribution to German library rehabilitation after the first world war, and suggestions that the American Book Center continue operations as a publications exchange clearinghouse have been noted, as well as proposals before UNESCO for setting up an international clearing-

house. Restoration of commercial channels has, of course, been a major objective of USIBA.

Central depository libraries in Europe for less important serials have been proposed as one means of making resources go further.⁷⁹⁸

There have also been hopes that 'rehabilitation could be linked to a movement for organizing popular library service on a scale previously unknown in many European countries. A plan was presented in 1944 for a circulating library service in the liberated countries.⁷⁹⁹ Milam has urged that UNESCO do everything it can to assist countries which, like Czechoslovakia after the war of 1914-18, try to establish systems of popular libraries.⁸⁰⁰ It has been suggested that UNESCO circulate detailed descriptions of methods of servicing, financing, and staffing national public library services, and that delegates be invited from countries without such services to observe successful public library systems.⁸⁰¹

One special project that should help to make up for some of the gaps left by wartime interruption of communications is the preparation of a volume on library developments during the past five years.⁸⁰²

What are the most urgent needs for rehabilitation at present? Is adequate information on damage being collected?

Are activities of ABC and IABC sufficiently coordinated? Can anything be done now to improve the organization of allocation and of library cooperation within the devastated countries? What is to be done in the case of areas where the situation is still seriously unsettled?

What can be done, through rehabilitation, to encourage the building up of good national and popular library systems?

Should a survey of interrupted bibliographical enterprises be made? By whom? Who is to make the survey of republication needs and to coordinate programs in this field?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

The greatest need in connection with rehabilitation, Mr. Milczewski thought, is for more information on conditions in devastated areas. Mr. Carnovsky reported that the *Library Quarterly* is planning a special issue devoted to the library situation in Europe, which may throw some light on the matter. He feared it would not appear before April 1947.

Mr. Peiss believed that a great opportunity exists for urging the devastated countries, which face a more acute aspect of the resources problem than the United States does, to tackle it on a coordinated basis comparable to the one now being approached in this country. If a cooperative acquisitions program seems necessary here, it is even more imperative in countries with much smaller resources.

Mr. Brown suggested that the conference recommend that the question of a cooperative acquisitions program be considered by all libraries receiving aid from this country. In China, for example, there are efforts to get a specialization agreement in curricula as well as in library activities, but opposition is being encountered.

The UNESCO secretariat, Mr. Shaw added, has seemed inclined to put books where they would do the most good, regardless of whether or not the library receiving them had been devastated. Mr. Evans agreed; he urged that, regardless of rehabilitation, an attempt be made to meet the library needs of nations, with preferential treatment for those that suffered heavily in the war. There should be no effort merely to put things back where they were. Perhaps an assessment of damage is not needed so much as has been supposed; it may be more important to know which institutions should be strengthened.

Mr. Brown moved that, in view of the great destruction of library materials and the increasing flow of publications, all countries be urged to study cooperative plans for acquisition and for the development of subject fields within their libraries. Mr. Bernardo thought that this recommendation would be useful in the Philippines.

Mr. Shaffer reported that, in rehabilitation programs, it had seemed desirable to work through agencies in each country which represented all libraries and could best decide where materials ought to go. It had not been too difficult to locate such agencies or stimulate their establishment, but conditions were unsettled in the most devastated countries, and as a result, agencies were often superseded or duplicated. A supernational organization such as UNESCO may be able to help toward remedying this situation by inducing each country to concentrate its efforts in a single agency.

He also pointed out that rehabilitation has two aspects. It was first approached as an emergency, involving a need to get publications abroad, particularly on subjects vitally concerned with reconstruction,

and there had then been good reason to doubt that material should be held until satisfactory agencies were established to receive it; much had been sent abroad at once in the hope that it would be used. But the need for speed is less vital in the phase of rehabilitation which is now being entered.

Mr. Van Male pointed out that there are libraries in this country, particularly in the South and West, which need material and which might be brought into the picture when gifts are distributed from a national centre. Mr. McDiarmid was interested in plans for exchange pairing of institutions whereby each small college library could exchange with an individual foreign library.

Mr. Evans reported on a recent meeting of directors of the American Book Center at which it had been generally agreed that there ought to be an exploration of the possibility of continuing ABC as a coordinating agency for exchange among American libraries, largely by means of lists, such as those used by the Medical Library Association, but with some resources in a central pool. It was also contemplated that ABC would coordinate nongovernmental exchanges with foreign countries. This might provide for the disposition of accumulations of materials not needed in the United States. It had occurred to him that the Library of Congress could use ABC as an outlet for some of the leavings from its foreign document acquisitions. If the Farmington plan develops, ABC might become the agency for its administration. The directors had not been ready to make any final recommendations, but Mr. Evans was sure that they would be favorably disposed toward reorganization of ABC to serve such purposes.

Mr. Clapp reported that he had attended a meeting of the Commission for International Educational Reconstruction, which is sponsored by the American Council on Education and supported by Carnegie Corporation funds. Its aim is to bring together all groups interested in educational rehabilitation. Nineteen organizations had been represented at the meeting on books and periodicals. As chairman of the committee in that field, Mr. Clapp had asked if the United States still bears a responsibility for rehabilitating devastated areas with books. The answer of the committee had been unanimously in the affirmative. It is obvious that the agencies represented will continue to send books to the countries or libraries in which they are interested.

Consequently, Mr. Clapp recommended that librarians continue to support operations for sending books as gifts to devastated areas, but that the desirability of doing this in the interests of strengthening library organization be emphasized. Mr. Evans suggested that this is what ABC has been doing. Mr. Shaffer agreed that the material will go abroad in any case; the only question is whether or not librarians will try to channel the flow into the best foreign institutions. At one time Mr. Shaffer had listed one hundred and fifty organizations interested in sending books abroad. In the case of agencies that seemed to have desirable objectives, ABC had acted as a shipping agent.

Mr. Clapp believed that the organizations represented on the Commission for International Educational Reconstruction would probably call upon ABC to continue as a collection and shipping agency. Mr. Shaffer suggested that Mr. Brown's motion include a provision that it be brought to the attention of the American delegation to UNESCO, and Mr. Brown agreed.

At the request of Mr. Heindel, Mr. Young spoke of a recent project of the Social Science Research Council. There had been many requests from social scientists in Europe for books published since 1939, and promptness in meeting the need had been important. The Council had been asked to send approximately forty sets of the outstanding publications of the war years in its fields. The books were selected by specialists in each subject. Men familiar with Europe had been solicited for advice on where the books would be most accessible to the greatest number of social scientists. USIBA handled the buying and shipping, and most of the sets have now been sent.


Two hundred and fifty titles had first been sent, and the recipient had then been supplied with a list of additional books and invited to select from one hundred to one hundred and fifty that interested him. The object was to enable libraries to build up their resources in directions of particular interest; also, the Council had wished to avoid giving the impression that it was telling people what to read. The second list, consequently, had been quite inclusive. The plan seemed to have worked well, and Mr. Young wondered if individual ventures of this sort were not needed in some cases, partially for the sake of promptness, and in order to aim at specific European publics. Perhaps a central agency could have done it better, but the Council had felt that it must go ahead.

Mr. Evans thought the project thoroughly admirable, and was sure that ABC wishes other groups would do likewise. In response to a question, Mr. Young added that the program had been limited to countries occupied by Germany. University or research libraries had been selected to receive the books in most cases, and a proper selection of such institutions could not have been made on the basis of 1939 lists. Mr. Young also reported that copies of the book lists were available for distribution on request. Eighty books that should have been sent proved to be out of print, and it was suggested that ABC, if supplied with a list of these, might locate copies of some of them and send them to those institutions where the Council would have wished to place them.

Mr. Shaffer pointed out that there are several classes of material involved in rehabilitation. ABC has supplied publications needed in bulk, but particular materials are needed by individuals and institutions, and this is matched by library needs in this country for specific foreign materials. To some extent, the book trade and other normal channels will supply these wants, but many of them will not be supplied, particularly as long as there is no machinery for handling library duplicates or stocks of institutional publications. Finally, there is a strong inclination in many areas abroad toward reciprocity. The Belgians, Norwegians, or Poles would welcome opportunities to collect materials wanted in this country.

Mr. Evans added that, if ABC could continue, it might take advantage of this backflow of publications.

Mr. Brown's motion (page 151) was unanimously carried.



Agencies and Priorities

PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM

It may be worth while, in conclusion, to recapitulate the major agencies involved in the forms of international cultural relations that have been considered. It may also be proper to suggest the desirability of thinking about the relative importance and urgency of the needs and possibilities that have been observed.

There is a natural tendency to hope that a new agency such as UNESCO will prove capable of doing everything that ought to be done. UNESCO will doubtless make some studies and many recommendations, but perhaps it will finance and operate few projects in the fields considered here. If so, what should come first? International subject bibliography has been suggested. Is interlibrary loan, exchange, or attack on the barriers to communication more important or more suitable than bibliography?

IFLA and FID are the chief nonofficial international organizations in question. How should the field be divided between them?⁸⁰³ How much can either do without hitherto unprecedented financial resources?

Among the nonlibrarians involved are publishers, who should be expected to make particular efforts in the field of copyright and commercial exchanges. What can be done to help them?

The Department of State⁸⁰⁴ and the Library of Congress are the two major agencies of the American government that have been considered. Loan and personnel internship have been suggested as activities that might be pushed by American libraries abroad. Procurement in connection with cooperative specialization is another promis-

ing field for action. Are there others? Recalling the difference of opinion reported concerning United States libraries abroad,⁸⁰⁵ how much of its program should the Department operate directly, and how much should be handled through unofficial agencies?

The Library of Congress is already operating in almost every field mentioned, including selective and national bibliography, loan, microphotography, specialization, and exchanges. Additional projects have been suggested. What are the greatest contributions it can make if choice among desirable activities proves necessary?

The ALA, ACRL, ARL, and other national library organizations are instruments for collective action by librarians. For the public libraries, which form a great part of ALA's membership, selective bibliography and exhibits may be the most appropriate fields.

The ALA has had more than \$1,787,000, chiefly from the Rockefeller Foundation and the government, to spend on international activities during the period 1942-1948.⁸⁰⁶ It has no regular funds for such purposes. What is to be the future of its Washington office?

Must not specialization be agreed upon by libraries through ARL and ACRL before government agencies can do much more to encourage it?

Microphotographic experimentation and microprint projects, as well as the study and promotion of exchanges, call for action by libraries. Foreign students are a special responsibility of the library schools.

What else should library organizations do in the fields of bibliography, translations, personnel, surveys, and studies?

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Boyd pointed out that the conference had recommended and exhorted, calling upon one established institution or another to do what ought to be done. A conference of this sort has no continuity, and a great many organizations must cooperate if its recommendations are to be carried out.

Many scholars are completely unaware of the problems that have been under discussion, yet everything within their fields of specialization affects and is affected by the decisions that are reached on broad problems of this kind. Libraries and library associations have taken

the lead in studying these questions. Princeton, celebrating its bicentennial year by investigating the obligations of higher learning to society, has taken no account of such matters and apparently has failed to recognize that they are problems. Yet learned societies, universities, and foundations are among the constituencies that ought to be involved. Others include library associations, individual libraries, and businesses, particularly publishing.

Among the objectives considered was an inventory of national resources, which is fundamental to almost all the questions under discussion. Bibliography, technological problems, reconstruction, and exchanges are others.

What is there, Mr. Boyd asked, to bring together these constituencies and these objectives? At the top is UNESCO, but it would be foolish to expect an international body to do what has not been accomplished locally through all the existing agencies. Instead of a group of library associations or occasional conferences without continuity and in place of resolutions, is not a national cultural, educational, and scientific authority needed to do within the national area what it is hoped that UNESCO ultimately will do for the world?

If so, Mr. Boyd added, the first question, presumably, is who is going to pay for it. The conference has dealt with world-wide problems but has thought in terms of small change. A hundred million dollars, contributed by both the government and the constituencies mentioned and spent on a national cultural, educational, and scientific authority, would save a hundred million dollars in duplication of effort and waste and would accomplish much more than is being achieved by piecemeal efforts. If the proper framework and plan could be worked out for an authority to act and bring together in one effort all the available resources, Mr. Boyd thought it should be possible to get the money.

Mr. Evans reported that, when the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO was discussing its name in September, he had moved that it be called the U.S. National Commission for Education, Science, and Culture, but others had objected that this would give the impression that an institution of the sort just proposed was being created, whereas the Commission was to be an agency to tie this country into UNESCO's work. This did not, necessarily, mean that there would be general opposition to setting up another commission to do the job

Mr. Boyd had in mind. Coordination unquestionably is desirable.

Mr. Boyd said he had not conceived the organization as a coordinating body, but rather as an acting, operating agency. It should bring together representatives of all the groups named, and more, but it should be able to act rather than merely to recommend.

Mr. Downs asked Mr. Evans if he thought it possible that the U.S. National Commission would eventually develop into such an organization. Mr. Evans replied that its primary purpose is to discover what is thought in this country concerning the things UNESCO ought to do at the international level, and to coordinate these ideas into a specific program to be recommended to the State Department in terms of instructions to be given to American delegates to the annual conferences. The Commission is also to bring the UNESCO program home after the conferences and sell it to the American people. No one knows whether it will go further, but Mr. Evans doubted that it will carry much of the burden with which Mr. Boyd was concerned.

He suggested that the word "educational" be removed from the title of the organization proposed by Mr. Boyd. Education in this country means the public schools, which have very little interest in the things this conference wants to do. Mr. Boyd thought it might be called the National Library Authority. Mr. Peiss called attention to the desirability of bringing into it those industries that are interested in research. Mr. Williams wondered if Mr. Shaw would not agree that the term "documentation" takes in nearly everything wanted here and leaves out the public schools. Mr. Shaw assented, and Mr. David thought that "National Documentation Authority" would be good, but the word has no currency in this country. Mr. Shaw added that no one has been able to find an English term that does express the concept equally well. Mr. David liked "National Library Authority" but thought it suggested limitations that ought not to be there.

In response to questions, Mr. Boyd suggested that the idea be discussed by the ARL and by the Library of Congress Planning Committee. Mr. Evans thought it would be proper to ask the U.S. National Commission to consider the desirability of recommending to the federal government the establishment of such an authority. The Commission, he pointed out, is set up to advise the government in

general, not merely the State Department. Mr. Boyd explained that he visualized the authority as established by the government but supported, in part, by private agencies.

Mr. Boyd hoped that the Library of Congress Planning Committee would study the matter and, if it saw fit, recommend action to the National Commission. Mr. Evans preferred that any such recommendation come also from the ARL. It was then moved by Mr. Boyd and seconded by Mr. David that the ARL be asked to study the proposal with a view to submitting it to the U.S. National Commission and the Library of Congress Planning Committee. The motion was unanimously passed.

Mr. Shaw brought up the question of relations with the FID. He believed that the interests of FID cut across so many kinds of library activity in this country that ALA alone cannot serve as the American chapter of the organization. He thought it would be desirable to reconstitute the ADI under the ALA, ARL, American Council of Learned Societies, and Social Science Research Council, and make it the American chapter of FID. Mr. Carnovsky seconded his motion.

Mr. Williams wondered if Mr. Boyd's proposal might not lead to a National Council for Documentation or National Documentation Authority that ought to be the American chapter of FID, but Mr. Shaw thought the Boyd proposal much broader, since it involved a clearinghouse for action but did not contemplate the research services, interest in archives and in classification schemes, etc., which FID included. Mr. Boyd agreed.

Mr. David asked if, in revitalizing the ADI, there should be some extension of representation. Mr. Shaw replied that representation might be reduced in number yet extended in terms of intellectual fields; as it is, a great many government agencies and numerous societies are members, but the National Research Council might represent scientific agencies of the government as well as other science interests. Mr. Shaw's motion was unanimously approved.

Notes

I. AUTHOR BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Richardson, E. C. "Bibliography, the Basis of International Intellectual Cooperation," *I-AB&LA Proc.*, II (1939) 42-49.
2. Bishop, W. W. *Further Notes on Library Cooperation* (MS, 10 December 1945).
3. Evans, L. H. "History and the Problem of Bibliography," *C&RL*, VII (1946) 195-205.
4. Funck-Brentano, F. "Les Problèmes Bibliographiques et leurs Solutions," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, CXLV (1898) 175-99.
5. Chilovi, Desiderio. [Letter to Herbert Putnam] *IIB Bull.*, X (1905) 197-99.
6. Murray, Gilbert. "The Work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation of the League of Nations," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, II (1925) 18-24.
7. Godet, M. "Communication Concernant les Listes d'Ouvrages Remarquables," *CIB Actes*, III (Stockholm, 1930) 51-52.
8. "Vœux Adoptés par le Comité d'Experts Bibliothécaires, Paris, 16-17 juin 1932," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 17/18 (1932) 978-82.
9. "Inter-American Book Exchange," *ALA Bull.*, XXXI (1937) 800.
10. "Préparation de la Conférence Pan-Américaine de Bibliographie," *Coop. Intel.*, I (1929) 98.
11. Rivera, R. O. "The A.L.A. and Latin America," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIV (1940) 671-73.
12. Cf., earlier, ALA Committee on Library Cooperation with Latin America. *Selected List of Books in English*... (Chicago: ALA, 1942) and *ALA. Interpreting the United States* (Chicago: ALA, 1942, mimeo).
13. Gurin, Ruth M., and Baumgartner, Harriet M. "U.S. Information Libraries Prove their Worth," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 137-41.
14. Cole, G. W. "Bibliographical Method," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, II, 282-88.
15. Funck-Brentano, *op. cit.* (note 4).
16. Tourneur-Aumont, J. "Idées Bibliographiques en l'An II," *RdB*, XXXVII (1927) 362-91.

17. "Résolutions de la Première Conférence Bibliographique Internationale," *IIB Bull.*, XII (1907) 47-48.
18. Müller. "The Promotion of National Bibliographies as the Most Suitable Foundation for the Solution of the Bibliographic Question," *Int. Cong. Publishers*, III (London, 1899), [Papers] 53-61.
19. "Compte-Rendu du Congrès International de Bibliographie," *IIB Bull.*, V (1900) 217-48.
20. "Risoluzioni, Sezione 4," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 139.
21. Müller, *op. cit.* (note 18).
22. Campbell, Frank. *The Theory of National and International Bibliography* (London: Library Bureau, 1896) 152.
23. Ansteinsson, J. "A World Wide System of Documentation," *Cong. Mond.* (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 11-13.
24. League of Nations. Work of the Committee of Experts on the International Exchange of Publications, Geneva, July 17 to 19, 1924. *Report...* (A 19 1924 XII).
25. Pafford, J. H. P. *Library Co-operation in Europe* (London: LA, 1935) 171; *Deutsche Bücherei* (Leipzig: 1925); Malclès, Louise-Noëlle. "La Bibliographie Nationale Allemande dans le Cadre de la Deutsche Bücherei de Leipzig," *RdB*, XL (1933/34—années 44/45) 157-89; Siegismund, Karl. "Quel Intérêt les Éditeurs Ont-ils à la Création et à l'Entretien d'une Bibliothèque Nationale?" *Int. Cong. Publishers*, VIII (Budapest, 1913) *Rapports*, 219-30.
26. Childs, J. B. "Latin-American Current National Bibliographies," *LQ*, XI (1941) 360-63.
27. Gropp, A. E. "Research Needs in Latin American Studies; I: With Respect to Libraries," *I-ABR*, I (1941) 41-46.
28. "Discuss Inter-American Relations," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIV (1940) 23, 49-50.
29. Richardson, E. C. "American Books and Libraries from the Standpoint of Co-operation," *IIIC UIO Bull.*, II (1925) 238-62.
30. Evans, *op. cit.* (note 3). Cf. note 346.
31. Condit, L. "Bibliography in its Prenatal Existence," *LQ*, VII (1937) 564-76.
32. Berthold, A. B. "The Union Catalog Idea," in Randall, W. M. *The Acquisition and Cataloging of Books* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1940) 239-56.
33. Kenyon, F. G. *Libraries and Museums* (London: Benn, n.d.).
34. Hutchins, Margaret. *History and Practice of Inter-Library Loans in British Libraries* (MS thesis, M.S., Columbia, 1931); Newcombe, L. "Union Catalogues, National and Regional: Their Preparation and Utilisation," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XIII (1936) 65-76; Newcombe, L. "Aids to Library Co-operation in the British Isles," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XV (1938) 105-11, also in *Int. Conf. Doc.*, XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 50-52.
35. LA. *University and Research Libraries of Great Britain: Their Post-War Development* (London: n.d.).
36. Gosnell, C. F., and Schütz, G. "Goethe the Librarian," *LQ*, II (1932) 367-74.

37. Oehler, Richard. "Goethe's Attitude Toward Books and Libraries," *LQ*, II (1932) 232-49.
38. Fuchs, H. "The Gesamtkatalog of the Prussian Libraries," *LQ*, IV (1934) 36-49; Fuchs, H. "Der Deutsche Gesamtkatalog," *ZfB*, LIII (1936) 74-81; Fuchs, H. "Le Bureau de Renseignements des Bibliothèques Allemandes," *RdB*, XXXVIII (1928) 422-37; Juchhoff, R. "Gesamtkataloge und Auskantungerteilung," *Cong. Mond.* (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 203-8; Malclès, L.-N. "L'Œuvre des Catalogues Collectifs Imprimés à la Preussische Staatsbibliothek de Berlin," *AetB*, II (1936) 35-65; Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 144-51.
39. IIC Comité d'Experts pour la Création d'un Service International de Coordination des Bibliothèques, Paris, 27 et 28 janvier, 1928. *Rapports . . .* (Paris: IIC, 1928).
40. Janicki, W. "The Present State and Future Development of Documentation in Switzerland," *BSIB Proc.*, VII, pt. 2a (1945) 17-25; Godet, M. *Mémoire Concernant la Création d'un Catalogue Général et d'un Service de Renseignements des Bibliothèques Suisses* (Berne: 1927, Association des Bibliothécaires Suisses *Publications*, 8).
41. "Resolutions . . ." *I-AB&LA Proc.*, I (1938) 259-62; also Bouroncle, J. C. "Libros Antiguos," *I-AB&LA Proc.*, III (1940) 83-85.
42. Downs, R. B. "Latin American Union Catalogs," *C&RL*, VII (1946) 210-13.
43. ALA Committee on Bibliography. *A Restatement of the A.L.A. Plan for the Promotion of Research Library Service by Cooperative Methods* (Washington: 1930); also "Program of the Committee on Bibliography," *ALA Bull.*, XXV (1931) 698-99.
44. Downs, R. B. *Union Catalogs in the United States* (Chicago: ALA, 1942) 231.
45. *Report of the Informal Conference on Union Catalogs, Library of Congress, April 17th and 18th, 1936* (Chicago: ALA, 1936).
46. Downs, R. B. "Expanding the National Union Catalog," *ALA Bull.*, XXXVII (1943) 432-34; Downs, R. B. "American Library Cooperation in Review," *C&RL*, VI (1944/45) 407-15. H. A. Kellar's *Report of the Experimental Division of Library Cooperation, the Library of Congress, for the Period April 7, 1941 to April 6, 1942* (MS, 1 September 1942) notes approval by librarians consulted throughout the country.
47. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 44). Cf. Merritt, L. C. "The Regional Union Catalog as an Instrument of National Documentation," *LJ*, LXX (1945) 659-63; and Miller, M. A. "Union Catalogs—National, Regional, and Local," *LJ*, LXVI (1941) 59-62.
48. Richardson, E. C. *A Union World Catalog of Manuscript Books; Preliminary Studies in Method; VI, Summary of Method* (N. Y.: Wilson, 1937). For ACLS activities and interests, see Leland, W. G. "International Intellectual Relations," *American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals*, CCXXXV (1944) 83-91.
49. Lydenberg, H. M., and Milam, C. H. *Visit to Latin American Countries*

- Summer of 1944* (Washington: ALA International Relations Office, 1944, mimeo.).
50. "Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Constitution and Government of the British Museum . . ." *Athenaeum*, 1850, 499-502.
 51. Downs, R. B. "One for All; A Historical Sketch of Library Cooperation, 1930-1970," in Danton, Emily M. *The Library of Tomorrow* (Chicago: ALA, 1939) 60-67.
 52. National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation. Cultural Institutions Round Table. *Report, 26 September 1946* (mimeo.).
 53. dell'Acqua, L. *Elenco dei Giornali e delle Opere Periodiche Esistenti Presso Pubblici Stabilimenti a Milano* (Milan: 1859).
 54. Mummendey, R. *Bibliographie der Gesamt-Zeitschriften-Verzeichnisse* (Cologne: Pick, 1939, *Kölner Bibliographische Arbeiten*, IV).
 55. Cf. discussion of benefits by Van Male, J. "Union Catalogs and the Point of Diminishing Returns," *ALA Bull.*, XXXII (1938) 860-61.
 56. In American Association for the Advancement of Science *Proc.*, IV (1850) 165-76.
 57. Jahr, T. and Strohm, A. J. "Appendix VI," in U.S. Librarian of Congress *Report, 1901/1902*, 109-224.
 58. Krassovsky, D. M. "Bibliographical Work in Russia," *LQ*, IV (1934) 449-66.
 59. Russell, J. R. "Cooperative Cataloging in Europe," *C&CYbk*, VI (1937) 16-25; Hanson, J. C. M. "International Cataloguing," *ALI Papers & Proc.*, 1919, 196-202.
 60. Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 59); also "The A.L.I. Plan of Coöperation by Specialization," *ALI Papers & Proc.*, 1916, 59-61.
 61. Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 59); also Cong. IABCMC, I (Havana, 1942) *Acta Final*, 33-34.
 62. Lasso de La Vega, J. "Cooperative Cataloguing," *CIB Actes*, VII (Madrid, 1934) 105-6; Dolge, R. "A Few Thoughts on Inter-American Bibliographic Cooperation," *I-AB&LA Proc.*, II (1939) 61-64.
 63. Rider, F. "Real Co-operative Cataloging—the Concrete Approach," *LQ*, XIII (1943) 99-112.
 64. Ellsworth, R. E. "Centralized Cataloging for Scholarly Libraries," *LQ*, XV (1945) 237-43.
 65. Hanson, J. C. M. "The Anglo-American Agreement on Cataloging Rules and Its Bearing on International Cooperation in Cataloging of Books," *IIB Bull.*, XIII (1908) 317-31.
 66. "Règles Catalographiques Internationales," *IIB Bull.*, XV (1910) 1-68; Otlet, P. "Le Code Universel des Règles Catalographiques," Cong. Int. Arch. B. (Brussels, 1910) *Actes*, 375-77.
 67. "Library Co-operation Between the United States and Mexico," *IIIC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 7/10 (1928) 215-16.
 68. Tobolka, Z. "Projet d'un Code International de Règles Catalographiques," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, II, 121-52. Cf. Hanson, J. C. M.

- "Cataloging Situation, 1929: Its National and International Aspects," *C&CYbk*, I (1929) 19-29.
69. Prinzhorn, F. "Gemeinsame Kommission fuer Normung auf dem Gebiet des Bibliotheks-, Buch- und Zeitschriftenwesens: Arbeitsprogram," *IID Communicationes*, IV: 1 (1937) 4.
70. "Collaboration et Aide Mutuelle entre Bibliothèques," *CIB Actes*, VIII (Madrid-Barcelona, 1935) 26-31. Reports of the Metcalf committee appear in *CIB Actes*, X (Paris, 1937) 61-63; XI (Brussels, 1938) 55-69; XII (The Hague-Amsterdam, 1939) 70-76.
71. *FID Communicationes*, XIII: 1 (1946) 14.
72. [Joint letter to M. Godet] 28 June 1946 (MS).

II. SUBJECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

73. Berthold, *op. cit.* (note 32).
74. Langton, H. H. "Co-operation in a Catalogue of Periodical Publications," *Int. Lib. Conf.*, II (London, 1897) *Trans. & Proc.*, 122-25; Prinzhorn. "Die Hilfsmittel der Geistigen Arbeit," *Cong. Mond.* (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 276-80.
75. Cf. note 43.
76. Schneider, Georg. *Theory and History of Bibliography*, tr. by R. R. Shaw (N.Y.: Columbia University, 1934) 71.
77. Frauendorfer, S. von. "Probleme Internationaler Bibliographie vom Standpunkt einer Fachbibliothek," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, II, 298-311, also published as "Les Problèmes de Bibliographie Internationale du Point de Vue d'une Bibliographie Spécialisée," *Chimie et Industrie*, XXII (1929) 1217-22.
78. Bradford, S. C. "The Extent to which Scientific and Technical Literature Is Covered by Present Abstracting and Indexing Periodicals," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XIV (1937) 59-71.
79. Harding, T. S. "The Sad Estate of Scientific Publication," *American J. of Sociology*, XLVII (1941/42) 593-601.
80. Cowles, Barbara. *Joint Committee on Indexing and Abstracting in the Major Fields of Research*, Circular Letter No. 2, May 1, 1943 (mimeo.).
81. Bradford, S. C. "Rationalisation in Bibliography," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, II, 9-19.
82. Bradford, S. C. "Sources of Information on Specific Subjects," *Engineering*, CXXXVII (1934) 85-86; also *op. cit.* (note 78).
83. Lydenberg, H. M. "Tomorrow," *LQ*, VII (1937) 301-16.
84. ALA Serials Section. Committee on Indexes and Abstracting Services. "Tabular Analysis of 550 Titles in the Field of Periodicals Indexing and Abstracting," *LJ*, LXIV (1939) 354-57. Cf. the same committee's "Preliminary Survey . . ." *LJ*, LXIII (1938) 265-71.
85. Cowles, *op. cit.* (note 80). Cf. a report showing the total cost of medical abstracting journals to be \$1,156 per year, in addition to which sections in

- 146 clinical journals were found, Cunningham, Eileen R. "Problem of Abstract Publications in Medical and Allied Sciences," *Medical LA Bull.*, XXVI (1937/38) 211-17.
86. Jaryc, Marc. "La Documentation Courante dans le Domaine des Sciences Historiques—Problèmes et Méthodes," Cong. Mond. (Paris. 1937) *Communications*, 198-202.
87. Cunningham, *op. cit.* (note 85); also her "Third Report of the Subcommittee on Production and Cost of Books and Periodicals," *CIB Actes*, XI (Brussels, 1938) 78-84.
88. Harding, *op. cit.* (note 79).
89. Lewkowitsch, Jason. "The Co-ordination of Scientific Literature," Int. Conf. Doc., XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 253-57.
90. Lancaster-Jones, E. "First Report of the Sub-committee on Special Libraries and Information Centres . . ." *CIB Actes*, IX (Warsaw, 1936) 73-82.
91. Cunningham, *op. cit.* (note 87).
92. Goode, G. B. "The Ideal Index to Scientific Literature," *Science*, n.s., I (1895) 433-37; also "Compte-Rendu . . ." (note 19).
93. Cowles, *op. cit.* (note 80). Cf. characteristics of a universal bibliography listed by LaFontaine and Outlet, "Création d'un Répertoire Bibliographique Universel," *IIB Bull.*, I (1895/96) 15-38.
94. Vorstius, Joris. "Un Nouveau Succès de la Coopération Intellectuelle Internationale," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930) 145-49.
95. Cross, J. A. "A Universal Index of Subjects," Int. Lib. Conf., I (London, 1877) *Trans. & Proc.*, 104-7; Larned, J. N. "The Organisation of Co-operative Work Among Public Libraries," Int. Lib. Conf., II (London, 1897) *Trans. & Proc.*, 120-21.
96. "The A.L.I. Plan . . ." (note 60).
97. Thornton, J. L. "Proposal for the Co-ordination of Unpublished Bibliographies," *JDoc*, II (1946/47) 21-22. Cf. Root, *op. cit.* (note 315).
98. Bowditch, H. P. "A Card Catalogue of Scientific Literature," *Science*, n.s., I (1895) 182-86. Cf. Cunningham, *op. cit.* (note 87).
99. Fulcher, G. S. "Authors' Abstracts as an Aid to Documentation," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XVI (1939) 41-45; also "Bibliographie des Sciences Biologiques," *IIIC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 1/6 (1926/27) 312-15.
100. "Coordination of Scientific Bibliographies," *International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation*, 1934 (Paris: IIIC, 1935) 99; "La Deuxième Conférence Bibliographique Internationale: Votes and Decisions," *IIB Bull.*, II (1897) 175-76.
101. Odend'hal, Gabrielle. "Un Code d'Abbreviations pour Bibliographes," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, II, 289-91. Cf. the 1932 project of the Comité International des Sciences Historiques, reported by Jaryc, *op. cit.* (note 86).
102. "Risoluzioni . . ." (note 20).
103. IIIC. *Code International d'Abbreviations des Titres de Périodiques* (Paris: IIIC, 1930); *ibid.*, *Supplément* (Paris: IIIC, 1932).

104. "Code des Règles pour l'Organisation de la Bibliographie et Documenta-tion," IIB *Bull.*, XIV (1909) 185-252.
105. Pearce, J. G. "A National Intelligence Service," ASLIB *Rep. of Proc.*, III (1926) 118-22; also Prinzhorn. "The Present Position of the Movement in Germany for the Standardizing of the Forms of Books and Periodicals and of Library Methods with Reference to Its Wider Interest and International Importance," ASLIB *Rep. of Proc.*, VII (1930) 94-97.
106. "Comité d'Experts-Bibliothécaires," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 6 (1931) 281-86.
107. "Kommission fuer Normung der Hilfsmittel der Dokumentation," IID *Communicationes*, V:2 (1938) 56-60.
108. Ulrich, Carolyn F. "The Plea to Publishers of Periodicals," *LJ*, LX (1935) 561-63; also American Standards Association. *American Standard Reference Data and Arrangement of Periodicals, Approved June 7, 1943* (N.Y.: American Standards Association, 1943-Z39.1-1943 superseding Z29.1-1935).
109. Rottenburg, H. "Notes on the Need for and Organization of an Index of Technical and Scientific Literature," ASLIB *Rep. of Proc.*, I (1924) 71-73.
110. Predeek, A. *Die Adrema-Maschine als Organisationsmittel im Bibliotheks-betriebe* (Berlin: 1930); also his "An Ever-Ready Printed Catalogue," ASLIB *Rep. of Proc.*, VIII (1931) 41-49.
111. Davis, Watson. "Scientific Publication and Bibliography," Int. Conf. Doc., XIII (Copenhagen, 1935) *Rapports*, unpagged; also printed in IID *Com-municationes*, III:1 (1936).
112. Rider, Fremont. *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library* (N.Y.: Hadham, 1944).
113. Williams, E. E. "Microbibliography: A Possible Alternative to Microcards," ALA *Bull.*, XXXIX (1945) 450-52.
114. Teare, R. F. "Microphotography and Cataloging: A Forecast," *C&RL*, VII (1946) 231-36.
115. Chilovi, *op. cit.* (note 5).
116. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 310-18; Donker Duyvis, F. "The International Federation for Documentation," *JDR*, III (1940) 176-91.
117. DuBiez, Z. "De la Nécessité d'un Classement Méthodique dans les Cata-logues de Librairie," Int. Cong. Publishers, I (Paris, 1896) *Documents-Rapports*, 38-46, 204-6.
118. World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 126.
119. Pollard, A. F. C. "The British Society for International Bibliography," BSIB *Proc.*, II (1940) 13-32; IIB *Publication*, 156; Bradford, S. C. "The Necessity for the Standardisation of Bibliographical Methods," ASLIB *Rep. of Proc.*, V (1928) 104-13.
120. Cross, *op. cit.* (note 95).
121. Bradford, S. C. "Why the Science Library Adopted the Universal Decimal Classification," *LJ*, LV (1930) 1000-5.
122. Bradford, S. C. "The Coordination of Documentation," BSIB *Proc.*, I (1939) 11-15.

123. Bradford, S. C. "Towards Union Cataloguing," *LAR*, n.s., VII:28 (1929) *24-*29.
124. Frauendorfer, S. von, *op. cit.* (note 77); also his "Classification Problems in an International Special Library," *LQ*, IV (1934) 223-33.
125. Lancaster-Jones, E. "The Classification Décimale Universelle and International Bibliography," Int. Conf. Doc., XII (Brussels, 1933) *Rapports*, 33-45 (IID *Publication*, 172a); Grolier, E. de. "État Présent du Problème de la Classification Bibliographique, Bibliothéconomique et Documentaire," Cong. Mond. (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 147-56.
126. Schneider, *op. cit.* (note 76) 231-33.
127. Lancaster Jones, E. "The Evolution of a Cooperative Classified Bibliography of Science and Technology," IID *Communicationes*, III:2 (1936).
128. Bradford, *op. cit.* (note 82).
129. Prinzhorn, *op. cit.* (note 74); Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 105).
130. Goode, *op. cit.* (note 92).
131. Lancaster-Jones, *op. cit.* (note 90).
132. Axon, W. E. A. "The Projected Universal Catalogue," *LJ*, III (1878) 175-77.
133. Mitchell, P. C. "The Uses of the World List of Scientific Periodicals," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, II (1925) 11-17.
134. Campbell, *op. cit.* (note 22) 79, 98; Rosenhain, W. "Scientific Abstracting," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, V (1928) 73-79; Frascchetti, I. S. "Il Problema della Collaborazione Bibliografica Internazionale in Rapporto coi Sistemi di Classificazione," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, II, 20-49; Nathan, F. L. "International Abstracting and Indexing of Scientific and Technical Literature," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, VIII (1931) 36-40; Pollard, A. F. C. "A Proposed Plan for the Mobilization of Bibliographical References to the Contents of the World's Non-fiction Literature," *BSIB Proc.*, V (1943) 55-73.
135. Spratt, H. P. *Libraries for Scientific Research in Europe and America* (London: Grafton, 1936) 122; Simon, C. "Une Œuvre Bibliographique de Haute Importance: Les Index de la Littérature Scientifique de l'U.R.S.S.," *RdB*, XL (1933/34—années 44/45) 311-16.
136. McMurtrie, D. C. *A Suggested Program for Augmenting Materials for Research in American Libraries, December 18, 1939* (n.p., n.d.) 23p.
137. Ellsworth, *op. cit.* (note 64).
138. Cowles, Barbara. "Indexing and Abstracting in the Major Fields of Research," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIX (1945) 370-71, 426-27.
139. "The Coordination of Abstracting," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XVIII (1943) 53-60.
140. Adler, Cyrus. "The International Catalogue of Scientific Literature," *Science*, n.s., VI (1897) 184-201; International Catalogue Conference. "Acta," *IIB Bull.*, I (1895/96) 281-92.
141. Otlet, Paul. "Le Catalogue International de la Littérature Scientifique," *IIB Bull.*, VII (1902) 203-9; also "L'État Actuel de l'International Catalogue of Scientific Literature," *IIB Bull.*, IX (1904) 105-9.

142. "Examen du Projet da Société Royale de Londres . . ." IIB *Bull.*, IV (1899) 5-73.
143. "Vœux Adoptés . . ." World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 214-16. Cf. the list in "La Documentation," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 77 (1937) 177-227.
144. Frauendorfer, S. von. "Report of the International Committee of Agricultural Librarians," CIB *Actes*, X (Paris, 1937) 177-79; also his "International Co-operation in the Field of Agricultural Documentation," Int. Conf. Doc., XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 52-56; and his "International Collaboration of the Agricultural Libraries of Different Countries," *Agricultural Library Notes*, X (1935) 344-47.
145. Gerard, Jean. "L'Office International de Chimie, ses Buts, son Activité," Cong. Mond. (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 129-34.
146. "Coordination de la Bibliographie dans les Sciences Économiques," IIIC *Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 1/6 (1926/27) 10-15; also Vos van Steenwijk, J. E. de. "The International Institute for Intellectual Co-operation," *LJ*, LIII (1928) 7-10.
147. "La Coordination des Centres Nationaux de Documentation Pédagogique," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 27/28 (1933) 175-77.
148. Jaryc, *op. cit.* (note 86).
149. Kauffmann, H. L. M. "La Documentation en Philosophie," Cong. Mond. (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 212-15.
150. "Risoluzioni . . ." (note 20). Cf. Frauendorfer, *op. cit.* (note 77).
151. "Institut International d'Agriculture," *ActB*, II (1936) 66-69.
152. Shaw, R. R. "The United States Department of Agriculture Library," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 333-35.
153. Jones, H. W. "A Consideration of the Future Relations of the Medical Libraries with Our National Medical Library," *LQ*, XI (1941) 36-45.
154. Cunningham, *op. cit.* (note 85).
155. Spratt, *op. cit.* (note 135) 54-58, 135-39.
156. Kofoid, C. A. "Cooperation in Scientific Bibliography," *Science*, n.s., XXVII (1908) 543-45; Hoyle, W. E., and Nördlinger, C. "The 'Concilium Bibliographicum' at Zürich and Its Work," *LAR*, I (1899) 709-18.
157. Lhéritier, Michel. "Une Grande Entreprise de Coopération Intellectuelle," IIIC *Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 1/6 (1926/27) 145-59.
158. Delcambre, E. "Le Bureau Météorologique International," IIIC *Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 1/6 (1926/27) 28-36.
159. Grolier, Georgette and E. de. "La Documentation du Documentaliste," Cong. Mond. (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 159-60.
160. "Bibliographies des Sciences Biologiques" (note 99).
161. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 310-18; LaFontaine and Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 93); "La Deuxième Conférence . . ." (note 100).
162. Dewey, Melvil. "Institut International de Bibliographie," *ALI Papers & Proc.*, 1919, 206-8; Bishop, W. W. "International Relations," *ALA Bull.*, XXI (1927) 282-89.
163. Murray, *op. cit.* (note 6).

164. "Résolutions," Cong. Int. Bib. & AL (Prague, 1926) *P-V et Mém.*, I, 74-83.
165. UNESCO Preparatory Commission. Committee on Libraries, Museums, Publications and Special Projects. *Memorandum on Problems and Policies in the Development of World Library and Information Services, Prepared by the Counsellor for Libraries & Museums, 15 May 1946* (mimeo.).
166. Beck, Hermann. *Die Internationale Bibliographie und ihre Zukunft* (Dresden: Boehmert, 1907), also in *Kritische Blaetter für die Gesamten Sozialwissenschaften*, III (1907) 203-12; *Union Internationale pour la Bibliographie et la Documentation—Memorandum* (Brussels: IIB, 1919, IIB Publication, 127); IIB Publication, 155 (1928).
167. Otlet, Paul. "L'Institut International de Bibliographie," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, II (1925) 25-36; also his "Le Répertoire Bibliographique Universel et l'Œuvre Cooperative de l'Institut International de Bibliographie," Cong. Int. Bib. & AL (Prague, 1926) *P-V et Mém.*, II, 439-55; and his "Réseau Universel de Documentation," *IID Communicationes*, IV:1 (1937) 13-16.
168. Gerard, Jean. "L'Organisation Mondiale de la Documentation Universelle," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 22/23 (1932) 1325-32.
169. "Conférences et Symposium Concernant la Documentation," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 49/50 (1935) 55-60.
170. Ansteinsson, *op. cit.* (note 23).
171. Donker Duyvis, F. "L'Organisation Mondiale de la Documentation," *IID Communicationes*, IV:2 (1937) 14-20.
172. Josephson, A. G. S. "An International Congress of Bibliography," *Science*, n.s., II (1895) 74-75; also "Résolutions . . ." (note 17).
173. FID, *op. cit.* (note 71).
174. Josephson, A. G. S. "Wanted—a Bibliographical Institute," *Dial*, XXIX (1900) 48. Kellar, *op. cit.* (note 46) found general approval for the idea.
175. Wilson, H. W. "United We Go Forward," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, IV, 86-91.
176. "Les Associations Internationales et l'Organisation de la Documentation," *IIB Bull.*, XV (1910) 182-97.
177. Leland, *op. cit.* (note 48).
178. Cowles, *op. cit.* (note 138).
179. ARL Committee on Indexing and Abstracting. *Minutes, December 30th, 1945* (MS).
180. Evans, *op. cit.* (note 3).
181. White, C. M. "The Modern Library: Most Powerful Non-Commercial Medium," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 435-38.
182. UNESCO Preparatory Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 165); cf. *UNESCO Library and Bibliographical Program* (mimeo., enclosed with letter of R. R. Shaw, 21 August 1946).
183. UNESCO Preparatory Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 165).
184. National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52).
185. U.S. Department of State. Division of Public Liaison. *Progress Report*, 2, August 12, 1946 (mimeo.).

III. INTERLIBRARY LOAN

186. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 18-19.
187. *Ibid.*, 61.
188. Condit, *op. cit.* (note 31).
189. Gosnell and Schütz, *op. cit.* (note 36).
190. Jewett, *op. cit.* (note 56).
191. Green, S. S. "The Lending of Books to One Another by Libraries," *LJ*, I (1876/77) 15-16.
192. Green, S. S. "Address of the President," *LJ*, XVI (1891) conference number, 1-9.
193. "Note Sommaire sur le Prêt des Ouvrages de Bibliothèque à Bibliothèque," *IIB Bull.*, XIII (1908) 95-98; Mortet, C. "Le Prêt de Bibliothèque à Bibliothèque en France et à l'Étranger," *Association des Bibliothécaires Français Bull.*, III (1909) 85-92.
194. Dziatzko, K. "The International Mutual Relations of Libraries," *LJ*, XVIII (1893) 465-68, also appeared in *ZfB*. X (1893) 457-63.
195. Mortet, *op. cit.* (note 193).
196. Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 167, first item); also *IIB, op. cit.* (note 166, last item).
197. Vos van Steenwijk, *op. cit.* (note 146).
198. "The A.L.I. Plan . . ." (note 60).
199. Milam, C. H. "Some Possibilities of Library Cooperation with Latin America," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIII (1939) 227-31; also ALA Special Committee on International Cultural Relations. "Report Number One," *ALA Bull.*, XXXVI (1942) 748-59.
200. Fabilli, Josephine C. "Cultural Centers: Libraries in United States Cultural Centers in the Other American Republics," *Record*, II:6 (1946) 9-19.
201. "Résolutions" (note 164).
202. Godet, Marcel. *Le Prêt International des Livres et Manuscrits* (Berne: Bibliothèque Nationale Suisse, 1937; Association des Bibliothécaires Suisses *Publications*, 15).
203. "Convention pour le Développement des Rapports Culturels entre le Royaume d'Italie et l'État Fédéral d'Autriche, 2 février 1935," *IIIC Recueil*, 65-74.
204. "Accord entre le Royaume d'Italie et le Royaume de Hongrie, 16 février 1935," *IIIC Recueil*, 144-50.
205. "Accord Relatif aux Relations Intellectuelles et Artistiques entre la République Française et l'État Fédéral d'Autriche, 2 avril 1936," *IIIC Recueil*, 53-58.
206. *CIB Actes*, V (Berne, 1932) 158-64, VI (Chicago-Avignon, 1933) 198-200, VII (Madrid, 1934) 74-75, XI (Brussels, 1938) 140-41, XII (The Hague-Amsterdam, 1939) 53-54, 134-36, 172.
207. Godet, *op. cit.* (note 202).
208. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 127-75.

209. Cf. Balcke, Curt. "The German Library World and Its System," *LAR*, n.s., V (1927) 101-21.
210. Cf. note 38.
211. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 161, 163.
212. Savage, E. A. "Memorandum on the Organization of Library Exchange Areas," *LAR*, XIX (1917) 328-29.
213. Sandbach, F. E. "Inter-Library Lending," *LAR*, n.s., III (1925) 230-41.
214. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 274.
215. Newcombe, Luxmoore. *Library Co-operation in the British Isles* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1937); Hutchins, *op. cit.* (note 34).
216. McMillen, J. A., ed. *Selected Articles on Interlibrary Loans* (N.Y.: Wilson, 1928).
217. Bishop, W. W. *International Loans Between Libraries, A Report on American and Canadian Experience made to the International Committee of the International Federation of Library Associations* (Oxford: University Press, 1931).
218. Van Den Gheyn, J. "La Suppression de la Voie Diplomatique pour le Prêt des Livres et des Manuscrits," Cong. Int. Arch. B. (Brussels, 1910) *Actes*, 25-28.
219. "Note Sommaire . . ." (note 193).
220. *Union Internationale . . .* (note 166).
221. "Le Prêt International des Livres," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 15 (1932) 716-18.
222. "Risoluzioni, Sezione 14," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 203-4; cf. Roland-Marcel, P. "Le Fonctionnement du Service du Prêt," *ibid.*, V, 163-66.
223. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 331.
224. "Code of Practice for Inter-Library Loans," *ALA Bull.*, XI (1917) 271-74.
225. "Proposed Interlibrary Loan Code," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIV (1940) 199-200, 216.
226. "Résolutions des Experts Bibliothécaires (Réunions des 11, 12 et 13 février 1929 . . .)" *Coop. Intel.*, I (1929) 188-90.
227. Kessels, Hilda. "Rapport sur le Prêt National et International," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 220-229.
228. Godet, *op. cit.* (note 202); also "Le Prêt International," *CIB Actes*, VIII (Madrid-Barcelona, 1935) 21-25.
229. *CIB Actes*, IX (Warsaw, 1936) 99-108; an English translation appeared in Danton, J. P. "International Interlibrary Loan," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIV (1940) 99-100, 112.
230. Sous-Commission des Questions Juridiques Relatives au Prêt International. "Rapport," *CIB Actes*, IX (Warsaw, 1936) 109-10.
231. Danton, *op. cit.* (note 229).
232. Bishop, W. W. "Inter-library Loans," *LJ*, XXXIV (1909) 527-32; Ogg, F. A. *Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences; Report of a Survey Conducted for the American Council of Learned Societies* (N.Y.: Century, 1928) 367; "Meeting of Experts for the Co-ordination of Libraries," *IIC Bull. of the Information and Reference Section*, 17 (1928) 5-6; "Service

- International de Coordination des Bibliothèques," *IIC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 7/10 (1928) 51-55; Ansteinsso, *op. cit.* (note 23); Cong. IABCMC, *op. cit.* (note 61).
233. Lane, W. C. "A Central Bureau of Information and Loan Collection for College Libraries," *LJ*, XXXIII (1908) 429-33.
234. Lord, M. E. *A Report upon the American Library in Paris* (mimeo., 21 May 1945).
235. Notes 203, 204, 205.
236. "Résultats de l'Enquête Poursuivie auprès des Bibliothèques de tous les Pays en Vue de la Constitution d'un Office International de Renseignements," *IIC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 1/6 (1926/27) 55-133, 276-308, 395-401.
237. Frauendorfer, *op. cit.* (note 144, last item); cf. Ansteinsso, *op. cit.* (note 23).
238. Fago, Vincenzo. "Memorandum on the Use of the International Exchange Services," *LA. Proceedings of the 50th Anniversary Conference* (Edinburgh, 1927) 212-14.
239. "International Library Co-operation," *LJ*, LI (1926) 1023-25; "Resolutions . . ." (note 41).
240. Hanke, Lewis. "The Latin American Bibliographical Activities of the Library of Congress, with Hints for Future Developments in this Field," *C&RL*, III (1941/42) 235-40.
241. Murray, *op. cit.* (note 6).
242. "Organisation des Instituts Nationaux de Bibliographie," *IIB Bull.*, VI (1901) 174-78; "Coordination des Travaux des Bibliothèques," *IIC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 1/6 (1926/27) 309-12; *IIC*, *op. cit.* (note 39); "Meeting of Experts . . ." (note 232); Alingh Prins, J. "Problems of International Documentation," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XV (1938) 21-29, also in *IID Communications*, V:4 (1938) 147-50.
243. "Résolutions . . ." (note 226).
244. *IIC. Coordination des Bibliothèques. Guide des Services Nationaux de Renseignements, du Prêt et des Échanges Internationaux*, 2d ed. (Paris: *IIC*, 1933).
245. Briet, Suzanne. "La Documentation en France; Esquisse de l'Effort Français pour la Documentation Universelle," Cong. Mond. (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 49-51; Huysers, P. C. P. "Nederlandsch Instituut voor Documentatie & Registratuur," *ibid.*, 187-89; Donker Duyvis, E. "Directories of Documentation Centres," Int. Conf. Doc., XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 191-97; Janicki, *op. cit.* (note 40).
246. Alexander, Mary L. "Undeveloped Opportunities for Special Libraries," *Special Libraries*, XXXI (1940) 183-92; Downs, *op. cit.* (note 46, second item).
247. Dupuy, Suzanne. "L'Activité Bibliographique et Documentaire à la Bibliothèque Nationale," *RdB*, XXXIX (1932—année 42) 5-49; also her "Le Centre Français d'Orientation," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 237-47.

248. Johnston, W. D. "Survey of Special Collections in American Libraries," *Special Libraries*, XIX (1928) 228-30; Kellar, *op. cit.* (note 46).
249. Oxford University. Congregation. *Library Provision in Oxford; Report and Recommendations of the Commission Appointed by the Congregation of the University* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931).
250. LA, *op. cit.* (note 35).
251. Lemaître, Henri. "Le Prêt International des Livres," *CIB Actes*, VI (Chicago-Avignon, 1933) 193-95.
252. Cf. Van Male, *op. cit.* (note 55).
253. Hand, Elinor. "A Cost Survey in a University Library," *LJ*, LV (1930) 763-66; Brown, C. H. "Inter-Library Loans: An Unsolved Problem," *LJ*, LVII (1932) 887-89.
254. Pafford, J. H. P. "Co-operation: National and International," *YWL*, V (1932) 61-83.
255. Breycha-Vauthier, A. C. "Quelques Obstacles au Fonctionnement du Prêt International," *CIB Actes*, XII (The Hague-Amsterdam, 1939) 55-56.
256. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 153-54, 160-61.
257. Cf. *YWL*, II (1929) 207-8; Kessels, *op. cit.* (note 227).
258. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 217); cf. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 331-32.
259. Emler, J. "Prêt International entre Bibliothèques," *CIB Actes*, V (Berne, 1932) 154-57.
260. Biase, Oreste de. "Relazioni Internazionali fra le Biblioteche," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 208-11.
261. "Contribution à l'Étude du Prêt de Bibliothèque à Bibliothèque," *IIB Bull.*, XIV (1909) 50-56.
262. Emler, *op. cit.* (note 259).
263. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 309.
264. *Ibid.*, 202.
265. *Ibid.*, 264.
266. "Note Sommaire . . ." (note 193).
267. "Le Prêt International . . ." (note 221).
268. McMurtrie, *op. cit.* (note 136); Bay, J. C. "Activities of a Scientific Reference Library," *C&RL*, II (1940/41) 99-102.

IV. PHOTOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTION

269. Goldschmidt, Robert, and Otlet, Paul. "Sur une Forme Nouvelle du Livre—Le Livre Microphotographique," *IIB Bull.*, XII (1907) 61-69.
270. Note 229.
271. Kenyon, F. G. "International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation," *LIR*, n.s., VI (1928) 32-35; Vos van Steenwijk, *op. cit.* (note 146); "Service International . . ." (note 232); "Réunion d'Experts-Bibliothécaires à l'I.I.C.I.," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930) 171-72, 192-94; IIC, *op. cit.* (note 244).
272. Donker Duyvis, *op. cit.* (note 171); FID, *op. cit.* (note 71); Huysers, *op. cit.* (note 245); Janicki, *op. cit.* (note 40).

273. Gerard, *op. cit.* (note 145).
274. Kauffmann, *op. cit.* (note 149).
275. Davis, Watson. "American Documentation Institute," in Raney, M. L. *Microphotography for Libraries, 1937* (Chicago: ALA, 1937) 64-66.
276. Raney, M. L., ed. *Microphotography for Libraries* (Chicago: ALA, 1936); *ibid.*, 1937 (Chicago: ALA, 1937).
277. Fussler, H. H. "Microphotography and the Future of Interlibrary Loans," *JDR*, II (1939) 3-10.
278. ADI. *Exchange of Microfilm Orders, Report by Ralph R. Shaw . . . February 18, 1944*. Cf. Davis, Watson. "The Uses of Microphotographic Processes in Documentation," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XIV (1937) 100-7.
279. "Réunion Restreinte d'Experts Bibliothécaires," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 53/54 (1935) 310-14.
280. Stewart, Irvin. "Microphotography for Scholarly Purposes," *JDR*, IV (1941) 44-52. Cf. LA, *op. cit.* (note 35).
281. Philadelphia Bibliographical Center and Union Library Catalogue. Committee on Microphotography. *Union List of Microfilms* (Philadelphia: 1942). *Supplements I, II, III, and IV, 1942-45*.
282. *Memorandum on Conference, May 21, 1945* (MS).
283. Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 167, last item).
284. *UNESCO Library . . .* (note 182). Cf. Moholy, Lucia. "Developments and Extensions in the Uses of Microfilm," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XIX (1944) 61-64.
285. Stewart, *op. cit.* (note 280).
286. Power, E. B. "University Microfilms," *JDR*, II (1939) 21-28; also his "University Microfilms—A Microfilming Service for Scholars," *JDoc*, II (1946/47) 23-31.
287. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 46, second item).
288. *Ibid.*
289. Power, *op. cit.* (note 286, second item); cf. Leland, *op. cit.* (note 48); also "ACLS, British Manuscripts Project," *PMLA*, LIX (1944) 1463-88.
290. Power, *ibid.*
291. U.S. Alien Property Custodian. *Report on Periodical Republication Program* (Office of Alien Property Custodian, November 1945, mimeo.).
292. Power, *op. cit.* (note 286, second item).
293. "Résolutions . . ." (note 226).
294. Goldschmidt and Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 269).
295. Rider, *op. cit.* (note 112).
296. Metcalf, K. D. "The Promise of Microprint: Appraisal," *C&RL*, VI (1944/45) 170-74.
297. Rider, Fremont. "Author's Statement," *C&RL*, VI (1944/45) 180-83.
298. Williams, *op. cit.* (note 113).
299. Teare, *op. cit.* (note 114).
300. Bennett, Mary A. "Brief Comments," *C&RL*, VI (1944/45) 175.
301. Rider, *op. cit.* (note 297).

302. Teare, *op. cit.* (note 114).
303. Philadelphia . . . *op. cit.* (note 281) *Supplement III* (1944) viii.
304. Power, *op. cit.* (note 286, second item).
305. Davis, *op. cit.* (note 111); Seidell, Atherton. "A Plan for the Dissemination of Scientific Literature by Means of Microfilms," *IID Communicationes*, IV:1 (1937) 24-25; Moholy, Lucia. "Documentary Reproduction," *Nature*, CLVII (1946) 38-40; *UNESCO Library* . . . (note 182) 3.
306. Otlet, Paul. "La Technique et l'Avenir du Périodique," *IIB Bull.*, VI (1901) 179-84.
307. *UNESCO Library* . . . (note 182) 11.
308. Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 167, first item).
309. Grunberg, I. "Les Progrès et la Diffusion de Publications Scientifiques sur Fiches ou Feuilllets Mobiles," *Int. Conf. Doc.*, XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 116-19.
310. Bishop, W. W. "Union Catalogs," *LQ*, VII (1937) 36-49.
311. Lancaster Jones, E. "Microfilms in Libraries," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XVII (1942) 34-37.
312. Kellar, *op. cit.* (note 46) 170-71.
313. Davis, *op. cit.* (note 111); also Davis, *op. cit.* (note 278).
314. Bush, Vannevar. *Endless Horizons* (Washington: Public Affairs, 1946).

V. COOPERATIVE ACQUISITION AND SPECIALIZATION

315. Larned, *op. cit.* (note 95); Root, A. S. "President's Address," *ALA Bull.*, XVI (1922) 88-92.
316. Hunt, M. Louise. "Co-operation Among Libraries," *LJ*, LI (1926) 827-30.
317. Bishop, W. W. *Carnegie Corporation and College Libraries 1929-1938* (N.Y.: Carnegie Corp. of N.Y., 1938); also his "Centralized Purchasing for American College Libraries," *LQ*, VII (1937) 465-70.
318. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 229.
319. Brown, C. H. "Co-operative Purchasing in China," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 27-28.
320. *Draft Agreement for the Cooperative Purchasing of Current Chinese Publications for American Libraries* (mimeo., n.d.).
321. Brown, C. H. *Summary Report of the Activities of the ALA Committee on the Orient and Southwest Pacific, 12 December 1945* (MS).
322. Brown, C. H. *A Proposed Cultural Program for Sino-American Relations Involving Libraries* (mimeo., 1943).
323. "Discuss Inter-American Relations" (note 28).
324. Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 105).
325. Newcombe, *op. cit.* (note 215).
326. Laski, H. J. "The Library in the Post-War World," *LJ*, LXX (1945) 382-85.
327. Frauendorfer, *op. cit.* (note 144, last item).
328. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 61.
329. Downs, R. B. "Problems in the Acquisition of Research Materials," in

- Randall, W. M. *The Acquisition and Cataloging of Books* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1940) 59-75.
330. ALA Board on Resources of American Libraries. *Library Specialization; Proceedings of an Informal Conference* (Chicago: ALA, 1941); cf. Taube, Mortimer. "The Realities of Library Specialization," *LQ*, XII (1942) 246-56.
331. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 61.
332. *Ibid.*, 129.
333. Fuchs, *op. cit.* (note 38, first item).
334. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 174-75; Balcke, *op. cit.* (note 209); Jürgens, A. "Un Office Central des Bibliothèques Allemandes," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930) 473-83; also his "Neue Wege in der Beschaffung des Wissenschaftlichen Buches," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 190-98.
335. Cordey, Jean. "L'Entente des Grandes Bibliothèques Parisiennes et ses Conséquences pour l'Union de Coopération Intellectuelle Internationale," *RdB*, XXXIV (1924) 411-17; Lacroix, A. "Répartition des Périodiques Étrangers entre les Grandes Bibliothèques de Paris," *RdB*, XXXVI (1926) supplément, 32-33; Cordey, Jean. "La Bibliothèque Nationale et son Adaptation aux Nécessités Actuelles," *Cong. Int. Bib. & AL* (Prague, 1926) *P-V et Mém.*, II, 112-17.
336. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 46, second item).
337. Arnett, L. D. "Cooperation of Libraries in Buying and Lending Books," *LJ*, LIV (1929) 61-64.
338. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 310).
339. Carlson, W. H., and Smith, Bernice S. "Proceedings of the Conference on Library Specialization," *PNLA Quarterly*, VIII (1943/44) 52-59; Downs, R. B. "Mobilization of Library Resources," *School and Society*, XLIII (1936) 368-70.
340. Tourneur, Victor. "Le Congrès des Bibliothécaires et des Bibliophiles de Paris," *AetB de Belgique*, I (1923) 42-47.
341. Gaspar, Camile. "Bibliothèques Générales et Bibliothèques Spéciales," *AetB de Belgique*, II (1924) 113-18.
342. McColvin, L. R. "Specialisation and Information," *LR*, IV (1933/34) 329-36.
343. LA, *op. cit.* (note 35); also its *Programme for a Survey of Research Library Resources in the British Isles* (mimeo.).
344. Yen, W. Y. "Co-operation Between Libraries in China," in *Libraries in China: Papers Prepared on the Occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the Library Association of China* (Peiping: LA of China, 1935) 73-89.
345. MacLeish, A. *General Survey and Statement of Objectives by the Librarian* (reprinted from *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress*, 1939/40).
346. Andrews, C. W. "The Field of Coöperation Between Libraries of Learning," *ALI Papers & Proc.*, 1916, 54-58.
347. Root, *op. cit.* (note 315).
348. Keogh, Andrew. "Our Library Resources as Shown by Some Government Needs in the War," *ALA Bull.*, XIII (1919) 270-73.
349. "The A.L.I. Plan . . ." (note 60).

350. Richardson, E. C. "University Library Co-operation and Business Engineering," *LJ*, XLVII (1922) 443-49.
351. ALA Committee on Bibliography, *op. cit.* (note 43).
352. Richardson, E. C. *Some Aspects of Cooperative Cataloguing* (N.Y.: Wilson, 1934).
353. Richardson, E. C. *General Library Co-operation and American Research Books* (Yardley: Cook, 1930) 32.
354. Cannon, C. L. "Regional Grouping of Libraries: Plan Suggested for Periodical Purchasing Areas," *ALA Bull.*, XXIII (1929) 331-33.
355. Van Male, *op. cit.* (note 55); Downs, *op. cit.* (note 51).
356. ALA, *op. cit.* (note 330).
357. Kellar, *op. cit.* (note 46).
358. *Final Report on the Conference on Bibliography and the Concentration of Research Materials in the Field of Latin American Studies* (mimeo., 11 August 1939).
359. Hanke, *op. cit.* (note 240).
360. Milczewski, M. A. [International Relations Board letter] 8 April 1946 (mimeo.) 8.
361. Besterman, T. "Proposal for an International Library Clearing-House," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XVIII (1943) 21-27.
362. Metcalf, K. D., and Williams, E. E. "Proposal for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials," *C&RL*, V (1943/44) 105-9.
363. Williams, E. E. "Research Library Acquisitions from Eight Countries," *LQ*, XV (1945) 313-23.
364. *Memorandum . . .* (note 282).
365. MacLeish, A. [Letter to L. H. Evans] 4 August 1945 (MS).
366. Clapp, V. W. "The Purchase of Books in Europe," *C&RL*, VII (1946) 127-34.
367. Peiss, R. "European Wartime Acquisitions and the Library of Congress Mission," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 863-76, 911.
368. *Conference on Russian Acquisitions, Library of Congress, June 29-30, 1945* (mimeo.).
369. Yuan, T. L., and Fairbank, J. K. *Memo—Sino-American Intellectual Relations* (MS, 31 December 1942).
370. ALA International Relations Board. *International Library Relations; A Memorandum on Opportunities for Government Participation* (mimeo., 23 June 1943).
371. Evans, *op. cit.* (note 3).
372. Humphrey, R. A. "The Department of State and the Acquisition of Research Materials of Foreign Origin," *C&RL*, VII (1946) 99-104, 108.

VI. INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF DOCUMENTS

373. Halecki, O. "Les Échanges Internationaux de Publications," *Cong. Int. Bib. & AL* (Prague, 1926) *P-V et Mém.*, II, 211-20.

374. Hanke, *op. cit.* (note 240).
375. Passier, Alphonse. *Les Échanges Internationaux Littéraires et Scientifiques* (Paris: Picard, 1880); cf. "Les Échanges Internationaux," *IIB Bull.*, XI (1906) 112-13.
376. Childs, J. B. "Experience of the Library of Congress under the International Exchange Act," *Public Documents 1935* (Chicago: ALA, 1936) 64-67.
377. Passier, *op. cit.* (note 375).
378. Conférence Internationale pour les Échanges des Documents Officiels Littéraires et Scientifiques. *Procès-Verbaux* . . . (Brussels: 1883).
379. Childs, J. B. "Division of Documents," in U.S. Librarian of Congress. *Report*, 1925/26, 71-87.
380. Brockett, Paul. "International Exchanges," Cong. Int. Arch. B. (Brussels, 1910) *Actes*, 92-96.
381. Childs, *op. cit.* (note 379).
382. "Le Service International des Échanges," *IIB Bull.*, XIII (1908) 99-111.
383. Molhuysen, P. C. "Service des Échanges Internationaux à La Haye," *RdB*, XL (1930) 59-63.
384. Cordey, Jean. "La Question des Échanges Internationaux," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 182-86; also his "Le Service Français des Échanges Internationaux et ses Vœux Concernant un Perfectionnement des Liaisons Internationales," *ASLIB Rep. of Proc.*, XV (1938) 114-15, also in Int. Conf. Doc., XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 209-10; Humphrey, *op. cit.* (note 372).
385. Halecki, *op. cit.* (note 373); also his report: League of Nations, *op. cit.* (note 24).
386. Halecki, *op. cit.* (note 373).
387. *Ibid.*; "Résolutions" (note 164); "Coordination des Travaux . . ." (note 242).
388. Vos van Steenwijk, *op. cit.* (note 146); "Risoluzioni . . ." (note 222).
389. Cordey, *op. cit.* (note 384, second item).
390. Rais, J., and Damiani, E. "Rapport de la Sous-Commission des Bibliothèques Parlementaires," *CIB Actes*, IX (Warsaw, 1936) 83-89.
391. International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. *Report by Professor G. de Reynold . . . on the Work of the Twenty-first Plenary Session, Geneva, July 17th-22nd, 1939* (C 231 M 153 1939 XII).
392. Edwards, C. [Report to MacLeish] (MS, 2 February 1944).
393. Brummel, L. "Les Principes des Échanges de Documents," Cong. Mond. (Paris, 1937) *Communications*, 53-54.
394. "Accord entre le Brésil et la République Argentine pour l'Échange de Publications," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 37 (1934) 61.
395. "Accord entre l'État Fédéral d'Autriche et le Royaume de Hongrie, 4 mars 1935," *IIIC Recueil*, 59-65.
396. "Accord en Vue d'une Collaboration Intellectuelle et Culturelle entre le Reich Allemand et le Royaume de Hongrie, 28 mai 1936," *IIIC Recueil*, 23-33.

397. "Protocole Relatif aux Relations Intellectuelles entre la Suède et la Tchécoslovaquie, 29 janvier 1936," *IIIC Recueil*, 168-69.
398. "Organisation . . ." (note 242).
399. Carter, E. J. [Letter to K. R. Shaffer] 20 June 1946 (MS).
400. "Le Service International . . ." (note 382).
401. Pinart, C. "Le Service Belge des Échanges Internationaux," *RdB*, XL (1930) 249-62.
402. Molhuysen, *op. cit.* (note 383); Hague. Koninklijke Bibliotheek. Ruilbureau. *Nederland en de Internationale Uitwisseling van Geschriften, door dr. L. Brummel* (The Hague: Algemeene Landsdrukkerij, 1930).
403. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 184-85.
404. Childs, *op. cit.* (note 379).
405. Wilcox, J. K. "Indexing and Distribution of Federal Publications: A Program for Action," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 1029-32.
406. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 February 1944 (mimeo.) 8.
407. Lord, M. E. *A Supplementary Presentation upon the American Library in Paris* (mimeo., 3 December 1945); Heindel, R. H. *The Past and Future of the American Library* (London) . . . (MS, September 1944).
408. Keator, A. A. "Inter-library Loans and New Methods of Conducting Library Exchanges," *Law Library J.*, XXXV (1942) 305-8.
409. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 329).
410. Bishop, W. W. *International Exchange of Publications* (mimeo., 24 November 1945).

VII. EXCHANGES BETWEEN LIBRARIES

411. Passier, *op. cit.* (note 375).
412. Bring, S. E. "The International Exchange Relations of the University Library of Uppsala, Sweden, and their Organization," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 167-81; Stojs, Max. "Die Rechtsgrundlagen des Akademischen Schriftentausches," *ZfB*, LII (1935) 53-85.
413. Cornélis, Henri. "Une Loi pour l'Intelligence," *AetB*, I (1935) 10-14; "Exchange of Copyright Deposit," *LAR*, 4 ser., I (1934) 117-18.
414. Richards, Elizabeth M. *Alexandre Vattemare and His System of International Exchanges* (MS thesis, M.S., Columbia, 1934); cf. Passier, *op. cit.* (note 375); also Quattlebaum, C. A. *Educational and Cultural Phases of U.S. Foreign Policy* (Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service Bull., 40, 1946).
415. Passier, *op. cit.* (note 375).
416. Hague. Koninklijke Bibliotheek. Ruilbureau, *op. cit.* (note 402).
417. Childs, *op. cit.* (note 379).
418. Balcke, *op. cit.* (note 209).
419. Bring, *op. cit.* (note 412).
420. Babb, J. T. [Letter to H. M. Lydenberg] 13 October 1944 (MS).

421. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 329).
422. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 410).
423. MacIver, Ivander. "Year's Study of Exchange," *LJ*, LIX (1934) 168-69; also her "The Exchange of Publications as a Medium for the Development of the Book Collection," *LQ*, VIII (1938) 491-509.
424. MacIver, Ivander. [Report on Exchange Survey] (MS).
425. Smithsonian Institution. *Annual Report*, 1937/38, 57.
426. Terry, Juanita. *Exchanges as a Source of Acquisition, with Special Emphasis on College and University Publications* (MS thesis, M. S., Columbia, 1939).
427. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 410); cf. Wilson, L. R., and Tauber, M. F. *The University Library* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1945) 148-52.
428. Fécamp, A. "Projet d'un Catalogue Général Annuel des Acquisitions des Bibliothèques Universitaires," *RdB*, I (1891) 417-32; Beaulieux, Charles. "Les Échanges Universitaires de la France avec les Autres Pays," *RdL&B*, III (1935) 50-53.
429. Stois, *op. cit.* (note 412).
430. Lemaître, H. "L'Accord Franco-Allemand du 15 juillet 1925," *CIB Actes*, VII (Madrid, 1934) 59-61.
431. "Risoluzioni . . ." (note 222); cf. Emler, J. "Échange de Thèses Universitaires," *CIB Actes*, V (Berne, 1932) 65.
432. Brummel, L. "De Internationale Oriëntering van het Bibliotheekwezen," *Bibliotheekleven*, XXII (1937) 3-29.
433. League of Nations, *op. cit.* (note 24); Halecki, *op. cit.* (note 373); "Les Échanges de Publications," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 27/28 (1933) 177-80; Cordey, *op. cit.* (note 384, first item); "Réunion . . ." (note 271); *CIB Actes*, III (Stockholm, 1930) 14-15.
434. "Résolutions" (note 164).
435. Vos van Steenwijk, *op. cit.* (note 146).
436. "Projet de Convention Relatif à l'Institut Interaméricain de Coopération Intellectuelle," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930) 260-63.
437. See notes 203, 204, 205, 395, and 396; also "Déclaration Relative aux Relations Scolaires et Intellectuelles entre le Royaume de Bulgarie et la République Tchèqueoslovaque, 8 novembre et 19 décembre, 1935," *IIC Recueil*, 102-7; "Convention entre le Royaume de Bulgarie et la République de Pologne, 8 avril 1935," *ibid.*, 98-101; "Arrangement entre la Pologne et la Yougoslavie, 2 décembre 1931," *ibid.*, 158-61; "Arrangement Relatif aux Relations Scolaires et Intellectuelles entre la République Tchèqueoslovaque et le Royaume de Roumanie, 21 janvier et 1 mars 1930," *ibid.*, 161-68; International Education Assembly, III (New York, 1945). *International Education Through Cultural Exchange, Proc.*, 29.
438. "Organisation . . ." (note 242).
439. Kenyon, *op. cit.* (note 271).
440. Carter, *op. cit.* (note 399); Lutz, Hans. "Über den Schriftentausch," *ZfB*, XLIX (1932) 283-97.
441. Delcambre, *op. cit.* (note 158).

442. Brummel, *op. cit.* (note 393).
443. Fago, *op. cit.* (note 238).
444. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 184-85.
445. Sury, Charles. "Réformes à Introduire dans le Service Belge des Échanges Internationaux," Cong. Int. Arch. B. (Brussels, 1910) *Actes*, 209-25.
446. Pinart, *op. cit.* (note 401).
447. *Report on Foreign Library Activities of the British Council, 1944-1945* (supplement, mimeo., to Milczewski [International Relations Board letter] 8 May 1946) 4.
448. LA. *International and Overseas Librarianship—Memorandum No. 2* (mimeo.).
449. Cordey, *op. cit.* (note 384, second item).
450. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 174-75; Jürgens, *op. cit.* (note 334, both items); Abb, Gustav. "Wege zum Internationalen Leihverkehr," *ZfB, L* (1933) 161-68.
451. Conference of German Library Directors in the American Zone, Stuttgart, 3-4 April 1946. *Minutes* (mimeo.).
452. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 184-85.
453. Charitakis, G. "Note on the General Council of Libraries in Greece," *CIB Actes*, VII (Madrid, 1934) 86-88.
454. Krassovsky, *op. cit.* (note 58).
455. Bring, *op. cit.* (note 412).
456. ALA International Relations Board. *Minutes, 5-6 May 1945* (MS) 17; Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
457. ALA Committee on Library Cooperation with Latin America. *List of Latin American Serials; A Survey of Exchanges Available in U.S. Libraries* (Chicago: ALA, 1941; ALA Committee . . . *Studies*, I).
458. ALA Committee on Library Cooperation with Latin America. *Distribution of Scholarly Journals of the United States in Latin America* (Chicago: ALA, 1942; ALA Committee . . . *Studies*, II).
459. *Conference . . .* (note 368); *Memorandum . . .* (note 282).
460. Brown, *op. cit.* (note 322); also his "Implementation of the China Program," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 238-41.
461. "International . . ." (note 239).
462. Frauendorfer, *op. cit.* (note 144, last item); Delcambre, *op. cit.* (note 158).
463. Gerard, *op. cit.* (note 145).
464. Guinard, J. "Sous-Commission des Échanges de Thèses—Propositions du Représentant de la France," *CIB Actes*, XII (The Hague-Amsterdam, 1939) 67-69.
465. *Union Internationale . . .* (note 166).
466. *Memorandum . . .* (note 282).
467. Shaffer, K. R. [Letter to M. E. Lord] 30 June 1946 (MS).
468. U. S. Department of State. Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Division of Libraries and Institutes. *Manual of Operations, June 1946*.

469. Lydenberg, H. M. [Report of Meeting, 13 August 1946] (MS); Heindel, R. H. [Enclosure with letter of 10 October 1946 to K. D. Metcalf] (MS).
470. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 46, second item); Downs, *op. cit.* (note 329).
471. Jürgens, A. "Der Deutsche Dublettentausch in Seiner Erweiterung zum Internationalen Austausch," *Int. Conf. Doc.*, XIV (Oxford, 1938) *Trans.*, 210-12; also his "Échange des Doubles," *AetB*, II (1936) 129-30.
472. Jürgens, A. "Der Suchdienst der Reichstauschstelle," in *Otto Glauning zum 60. Geburtstag* (Leipzig: Hadl, 1936) vol. I, 105-11.
473. Darrach, M. "The Medical Library Association," *CIB Actes*, VIII (Madrid-Barcelona, 1935) 81-82; cf. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 46, second item).
474. Cox, Eunice. "Cooperatives and Exchanges," *Law Library J.*, XXXIII (1940) 293-96.
475. Downs, *op. cit.* (note 46, second item).
476. Van Deusen, N. C. "Periodical Exchange," *LJ*, LXV (1940) 131-32.
477. Root, *op. cit.* (note 315); Collard, Auguste. "La Vente et l'Échange des Doubles," *Cong. Int. Arch B.* (Brussels, 1910) *Actes*, 191-94; Bykovský, Levko, in *Cong. Int. Bib. & AL* (Prague, 1926) *P-V et Mém.*, II, 94-106; Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 105); Richardson, *op. cit.* (note 353).
478. Alexander, *op. cit.* (note 246); Downs, *op. cit.* (note 51); McMurtrie, *op. cit.* (note 136).
479. MS proposal by R. R. Shaw.
480. Besterman, *op. cit.* (note 361).
481. League of Nations, *op. cit.* (note 24).
482. Schwab, E. L. "The Union List of Serials and Further Cooperation," *LJ*, LX (1935) 604-5.
483. Van Male, *op. cit.* (note 55).
484. *UNESCO Library* . . . (note 182).
485. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. *Yearbook*, VIII (1919) 65-66, 78.
486. Young, E. R. *Report of the Books for Europe Project of the ALA* (mimeo., 30 November 1942).
487. Cf. *Annual Reports* of ALA International Relations Board.
488. Heindel, R. H. "An Outpost Library at Work," *LJ*, LXVIII (1943) 979-81.
489. U.S. Department of State. Science, Education and Art Division. *Report*, May-June, 1944.
490. Valle, R. H. "Bibliographical Cooperation Between Mexico and the United States," *ALA Bull.*, XXII (1928) 296-99; cf. *Cong. IABCMC*, *op. cit.* (note 61).
491. Dolge, *op. cit.* (note 62).
492. "A Microfilm Exchange Between the Library of Congress and the National Library, Peiping, China," *IID Communicationes*, III:4 (1936) ZZ.3.
493. Roland-Marcel, P. R. "La Bibliothèque aux États-Unis," *Revue de Paris*, XXXV:4 (1928) 372-91.
494. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 August 1945 (mimeo.) 2-3.

- 495. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 410).
- 496. *Conference . . .* (note 368).
- 497. IICC, *op. cit.* (note 244).
- 498. U.S. Department of State. *Memorandum of conversation, 8 November 1945* (MS)

VIII. INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL EXCHANGES

- 499. "Opinions sur la Question des Traductions," *Coop. Intel.*, I (1929) 204-35.
- 500. "Library Co-operation . . ." (note 67).
- 501. "Convention entre le Royaume de Hongrie et la République de Pologne Relative à la Coopération Intellectuelle, 21 octobre 1934," *IICC Recueil*, 151-53.
- 502. "Convention Relative à la Coopération Intellectuelle entre le Royaume de Roumanie et la République de Pologne, 27 novembre 1936," *ibid.*, 153-57.
- 503. "Protocole Relatif à la Collaboration Intellectuelle entre la Pologne et la Suède, 7 juin 1935," *ibid.*, 157-58.
- 504. *Ibid.*, 168-69 (note 397).
- 505. *Ibid.*, 102-7 (note 437).
- 506. Int. Cong. Publishers, XI (London, 1936) *Compte Rendu*, 65-85. 189.
- 507. Murray, *op. cit.* (note 6).
- 508. *IICC Recueil*, 98-101 (note 437).
- 509. *Ibid.*, 158-61 (note 437).
- 510. *Ibid.*, 144-50 (note 204).
- 511. *Ibid.*, 59-65 (note 395).
- 512. *Ibid.*, 23-33 (note 396).
- 513. Marrubini, Carlo. "Échange des Annonces Bibliographiques entre les Journaux Officiels des Associations Éditoriales," Int. Cong. Publishers, X (Brussels, 1933) *Rapports*, 195-200.
- 514. "Risoluzioni, Sezione 3," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 133.
- 515. Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
- 516. "Vœux Adoptés . . ." (note 8); also "Vœux Émis par le Comité d'Experts pour la Bibliographie des Traductions, 18-19 décembre 1931," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 13 (1932) 625-27.
- 517. Ciarlantini. "La Coordination des Efforts des Éditeurs des Différents Pays et le Problème des Traductions," Int. Cong. Publishers, IX (Paris, 1931) *Rapports*, 203-13.
- 518. *Ibid.*
- 519. Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 105).
- 520. "Résolutions de la III^e Conférence Balkanique . . . Bucarest, 22-29 octobre 1932," *IICC Recueil*, 194-96.
- 521. World Cong., II (Madrid, 1935) *Actas y Trabajos*, III, 50-51.
- 522. "Subvention Gouvernementale en Faveur de la Traduction," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 2 (1931) 89.

523. Hanson, Haldore. *The Cultural-Cooperation Program, 1938-1943* (Washington: 1944; U.S. Department of State Publication, 2137).
524. U.S. Department of State. Division of Cultural Relations. *Report, October, 1943; December, 1943; May-June, 1944.*
525. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 March 1944 (mimeo.) 1; *ibid.*, 30 November 1943, 4; and 31 December 1943, 5.
526. Davis, Watson. "Translated Books for and from Latin America," *PubW*, CXLVII (1945) 1550-51.
527. Lydenberg, H. M. "The Common Interests of the Two Americas . . ." *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 279-81; Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 523).
528. Children's Library Association. International Committee. *Report, July, 1944* (mimeo.).
529. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 July 1945 (mimeo.) 6.
530. [National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation] Round Table. Cultural Institutions, Libraries, Museums and Publications. *Document No. 1, 23 September 1946* (mimeo.).
531. [Milam, C. H.] *Present and Recent International Activities of the ALA* (mimeo., 1 February 1945).
532. Ranschburg, Victor. "Des Commis-Libraires à l'Étranger et des Mesures à Prendre pour Faciliter leur Placement," Int. Cong. Publishers, VI (Madrid, 1908) *Rapports*, 129-31.
533. Int. Cong. Publishers, VII (Amsterdam, 1910) *Rapports*, 252-54, *Compte Rendu*, 96.
534. Int. Cong. Publishers, XII (Leipzig-Berlin, 1938) *Compte Rendu*, 315.
535. Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 523).
536. *Report of United States Publishers Who Visited the Other American Republics* (mimeo.).
537. Cunningham, Eileen R. *Planning Publications for Latin America* (MS, n.d.).
538. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 May 1944 (mimeo.) 1.
539. "Activities Broadened by British Publishers Guild," *PubW*, CXLIII (1943) 2241.
540. Ludington, Flora B. *Summary of British Council Activities, 1935-42* (mimeo., January 1943).
541. *Report . . .* (note 447) 5.
542. Lydenberg, H. M. *Notes About the Meeting of the Book Publisher's Bureau in New York, 21 November 1944* (MS); cf. Melcher, F. G. "Editorial," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 845.
543. "Inter-American . . ." (note 9).
544. d'Éça, Raul. "A Report on the Activities of the Inter-American Book Exchange," I-AB&LA Proc., II (1939) 286-92.
545. *Survey of Interchange of Books Between USA and Argentina, April 1943* (Cultural Memorandum, 261, mimeo.).

546. "Book Industry Export Corporation Papers Signed," *PubW*, CXLVII (1945) 446-48.
547. USIBA. *Prospectus* (mimeo., 1 June 1946).
548. USIBA. *A World United Through Books* (mimeo.); cf. "USIBA Brings Books to Europe," *PubW*, CL (1946) 368-75.
549. Simone, Yseulte W. *USIBA—Memorandum* (MS).
550. "USIBA Center in Mexico Will Open Soon," *PubW*, CL (1946) 182-83; "USIBA Announces Plans for Foreign Book Centers," *PubW*, CXLVIII (1945) 1544-46.
551. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 November 1945 (mimeo.) 1.
552. Benton, William. "A Full and Fair Picture of American Life," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 244-47.
553. Ernst. [Memorandum] (MS, December 1942).
554. Union Postale Universelle. Bureau International. *Résumé Alphabétique et Méthodique des Documents des Congrès et Conférences de l'Union Postale Universelle, 1874-1931* (Berne: 1932/33) II, 409-44.
555. Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, Congress, IV (Panama, 1936) *Convention and Agreement Relative to Parcel Post* (Washington: GPO, 1937).
556. CIB *Actes*, VI (Chicago-Avignon, 1933) 28-30, 62-66; IX (Warsaw, 1936) 35-37, 93-98; X (Paris, 1937) 67-73.
557. CIB *Actes*, III (Stockholm, 1930) 12; "Conservation des Manuscrits et Imprimés," *IHC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 7/10 (1928) 55-59.
558. "La Conservation des Manuscrits et Imprimés," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 1 (1931) 14-18.
559. Burton, J. O. "Permanence Studies of Current Commercial Book Papers," *Bureau of Standards Journal of Research*, VII (1931) 429-39.

IX. BARRIERS TO INTERNATIONAL INTERCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS

560. See notes 260-68.
561. Richards, *op. cit.* (note 414).
562. Bring, *op. cit.* (note 412).
563. Biase, *op. cit.* (note 260); Godet, M. "Communication Concernant le Prêt International et le Tarif Postal," CIB *Actes*, III (Stockholm, 1930) 53-54.
564. "Le Prêt International . . ." (note 221); "Les Échanges . . ." (note 433).
565. "Le Service International . . ." (note 382); "International Conference of Bibliography and Documentation, Brussels, July 10 and 11, 1908," IIB *Bull.*, XIII (1908) 297-316.
566. "Resolutions," I-AB&LA *Proc.*, III (1940) 363-65.
567. Hanke, Lewis. [Letter to C. H. Milam] 15 March 1939 (MS).
568. Cong. IABCMC, *op. cit.* (note 61) 22-23.

569. Milczewski, M. A. *Tercer Congreso de Bibliotecarios y Primero de Archiveros, Mexico D.F., October 23-28, 1944* (mimeo., 15 February 1945).
570. "Convention . . ." (note 203).
571. "Accord . . ." (note 204).
572. Fouret, Edmond. "Des Transports Nationaux et Internationaux en Matière de Livres, Journaux, et Publications Périodiques," *Int. Cong. Publishers, IX* (Paris, 1931) *Rapports*, 151-70; cf. League of Nations. Organisation for Communications and Transit. European Conference on the Transport of Newspapers and Periodicals, Geneva, November 25-29, 1929. *Records and Texts* (Geneva: 1930, C115 M36 1930 VIII).
573. International Education Assembly, III, *op. cit.* (note 437).
574. Cf. Smithsonian Institution. *Annual Reports*.
575. Milczewski, M. A. [International Relations Board letter] 1 September 1944 (mimeo.) 2.
576. See notes 257, 258, 259.
577. *Int. Cong. Publishers, op. cit.* (note 506).
578. "Librarians Protest Against Fordney Tariff," *PubW*, C (1921) 770.
579. "New Tariff Schedules for the Book-Trade," *PubW*, CII (1922) 1199-1201.
580. Cowley. "Work of the Sub-Committee on Bibliography," *IIIC Bull. des Rel. Sci.*, 7/10 (1928) 167-75; "Risoluzioni . . ." (note 222); "Les Échanges . . ." (note 433).
581. Lemaître, Henri. *Histoire du Dépôt Légal, 1^{re} Partie (France)* (Paris: Picard, 1910).
582. "Compte-Rendu . . ." (note 19).
583. *YWL*, II (1929) 207-8; Godet, Marcel. "Le Dépôt Légal: Aperçu de son État Actuel dans les Deux Mondes," *RdB*, XL (1930) 5-19, also in *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, IV, 339-52.
584. Lemaître, *op. cit.* (note 581).
585. *Ibid.*; also Crouzel, Robert. *Le Dépôt Légal* (Toulouse: Julia, 1936—thèse, Toulouse).
586. Pafford, *op. cit.* (note 25) 297.
587. Morel, Eugène. "La Loi sur le Dépôt Légal," *RdB*, XXXV (1925) 217-36; also his "Note sur l'Établissement d'une Statistique de la Production Intellectuelle," *World Cong.*, I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 301-4.
588. Partridge, R. C. B. *The History of the Legal Deposit of Books Throughout the British Empire* (London: LA, 1938); cf. Thorvald Solberg's review in *LQ*, VIII (1938) 528-36.
589. Balcke, *op. cit.* (note 209).
590. Solberg, *op. cit.* (note 588).
591. Richardson, *op. cit.* (note 29).
592. Spofford, A. R. "Copyright in its Relations to Libraries and Literature," *LJ*, I (1876/77) 84-89.
593. Godet, *op. cit.* (note 583).
594. *Le Dépôt Légal; Son Organisation et son Fonctionnement dans les Divers Pays* (Paris: IIIC, 1938).

595. CIB *Actes*, IX (Warsaw, 1936) 111-13.
596. YWL, XI (1938) 121.
597. Ranck, S. H. "Need of Additional Copyright Depositories," *LJ*, XX (1895) conference number, 43-45, 78.
598. Solberg, *op. cit.* (note 588).
599. Cong. IABCMC, *op. cit.* (note 61) 35.
600. Godet, *op. cit.* (note 583).
601. Note 413.
602. Layus, Lucien. "Du Dépôt Légal; Projet de Réforme de la Législation Actuelle," Int. Cong. Publishers, I (Paris, 1896) *Documents-Rapports*, 25-32, 198-99.
603. Marston, E. "The Presentation of Books to National Libraries," Int. Cong. Publishers, III (London, 1899) [Papers] 220-42.
604. Int. Cong. Publishers, V (Milan, 1906) *Compte-Rendu*, 116-17; Barbèra, P. "Abolition du Dépôt Légal et des Formalités Analogues," Int. Cong. Publishers, VI (Madrid, 1908) *Rapports*, 117-22.
605. Gili, Gustavo. "Le Dépôt Légal," Int. Cong. Publishers, IX (Paris, 1931) *Rapports*, 129-34.
606. U.S. *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI (1940) 63-78.
607. "Risoluzioni, Sezione 6," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 157-60.
608. "Vœux Adoptés . . ." (note 8).
609. "La Coordination Internationale des Études Relatives aux Droits Intellectuels," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 31 (1933) 365-73, 423-26; Schwartzkoppen, Luise von. "Die Rechtliche Zulässigkeit der Photokopie im Rechte des Auslandes und nach dem Entwurf zu einem Neuen Urheberrechtsgesetz," *ZfB*, LI (1934) 297-311.
610. "La Coordination . . ." (note 609).
611. Haan, C. J. de. "Photocopie et Droit d'Auteur," IID *Communicationes*, I:4 (1934) 25-40; Schwartzkoppen, *op. cit.* (note 609).
612. Huebsch, B. W. [Account of his paper] Int. Cong. Publishers, XI (London, 1936) *Compte Rendu*, 40-43.
613. "The Gentlemen's Agreement and the Problem of Copyright," *JDR*, II (1939) 29-36.
614. "Appendix II," ARL *Minutes*, XV (Cincinnati, 1940, mimeo.).
615. "Policy with Regard to Reproduction of Library Materials," *JDR*, III (1940) 244-46.
616. U.S. *Congressional Record* (note 606).
617. Stewart, *op. cit.* (note 280).
618. Olagnier, Paul. *Le Droit d'Auteur* (Paris: Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1934) 2v.
619. Eaton, A. J. "The American Movement for International Copyright 1837-60," *LQ*, XV (1945) 95-122.
620. Olagnier, *op. cit.* (note 618).
621. Eaton, *op. cit.* (note 619).
622. *Ibid.*, also Bader, A. L. "Frederick Saunders and the Early History of the

- International Copyright Movement in America," *LQ*, VIII (1938) 25-39; Rawley, J. A. "An Early History of the International Copyright Movement," *LQ*, XI (1941) 200-6; Solberg, Thorvald. *Copyright Miscellany* (Boston: Luce, 1939).
623. DeWolf, R. C. *Copyright Revision* (MS, 31 May 1945).
624. "The New Copyright Law," *PubW*, LXXV (1909) 1090-1105; Solberg, Thorvald. "Copyright and Librarians," *LQ*, IV (1934) 315-28.
625. "South America Takes Measures on Copyright," *PubW*, CXXXI (1937) 1489-90; American National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation. Committee for the Study of Copyright. *Comparative Study of Copyright Protection in Latin America, 1938* (n.p.); d'Éça, Raul. "International Copyright Protection in the Americas," *I-AB&LA Proc.*, I (1938) 242-50; Sanders, William. "The Protection of Intellectual Property of American Citizens in Latin America," *PubW*, CXXXIX (1941) 2456-60.
626. DeWolf, *op. cit.* (note 623).
627. Melcher, Frederic. "America and the Berne Convention," *Int. Cong. Publishers*, XI (London, 1936) *Compte Rendu*, 196-204; cf. his "Rapport sur l'Effort de l'Amérique pour Obtenir la Revision du Copyright," *Int. Cong. Publishers*, IX (Paris, 1931) *Rapports*, 123-27.
628. Leland, W. G. "Copyright," *Science*, n.s., XCI (1940) 215-16; Heyl, Lawrence. "Copyright Bill," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIV (1940) 254; DeWolf, *op. cit.* (note 623).
629. Book Publishers Bureau, Inc. *Distribution of U. S. Books Abroad* (mimeo., 2 October 1944).
630. McClure, Wallace. "Copyright in War and Peace," *American J. of International Law*, XXXVI (1942) 383-99.
631. DeWolf, *op. cit.* (note 623).
632. "Avant-Projet de Convention Universelle pour la Protection du Droit d'Auteur," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 64/65 (1936) 61-67; American National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation. Committee for the Study of Copyright. *Report on the Status of International Copyright Protection and on the Brussels Meeting of the Committee of Experts* (International Documents Service, 1938); "Copyright Conference on Pan-American Relations," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 3020; "Topics Up Before Inter-American Copyright Conference," *ibid.*, 3210-11.
633. LA, *op. cit.* (note 448); National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52).
634. Steinkopff, Dietrich. "La Situation du Droit d'Auteur et du Droit d'Édition en U.R.S.S.," *Int. Cong. Publishers*, XII (Leipzig-Berlin, 1938) *Rapports*, 233-45.
635. Olagnier, *op. cit.* (note 618).
636. *Ibid.*; also Weiss, Raymond. "Les Perspectives Nouvelles du Droit d'Auteur," *Coop. Intel.*, I (1929) 18-23.
637. Weiss, Raymond. "Vers l'Institution Internationale du Droit de Suite au Profit des Créateurs d'Œuvres Intellectuelles," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930)

- 108-13; IIIC. *La Protection Internationale du Droit d'Auteur . . .* (Brussels: 1938).
638. Int. Cong. Publishers, IX (Paris, 1931) *Compte Rendu*, 50-51.
639. "Tax on the Exploitation of Non-copyrighted Literary and Artistic Works," *International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, 1935* (Paris: IIIC, 1936) 98-99.
640. Evans, *op. cit.* (note 3); cf. Merritt, L. C. "World Book Production," in Downs, *op. cit.* (note 44) 77-82.
641. LaFontaine and Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 93); "Compte-Rendu . . ." (note 19); "Organisation . . ." (note 242).
642. Iwinski, M. B. "La Statistique Internationale des Livres; Rapport Présenté au Nom de l'IIB," Int. Conf. Doc., V (Brussels, 1910) [Rapports] No. 15; "La Statistique Internationale des Imprimés," *IIB Bull.*, XVI (1911) 1-139.
643. Walter, F. K. "The A.L.A. Committee on International Relations," *ALI Papers & Proc.*, 1919, 188-92.
644. Muszkowski, Jan. "Sur la Statistique Internationale des Imprimés," Cong. Int. Bib. & AL (Prague, 1926) *P-V et Mém.*, II, 412-22; "Résolutions" (note 164); Morel, *op. cit.* (note 587, second item).
645. Biase, *op. cit.* (note 260).
646. Ostertag, Fritz. "Rapport Concernant la Statistique Internationale des Imprimés et les Travaux Exécutés[!] dans ce Domaine par le Bureau de l'Union Internationale pour la Protection des Œuvres Littéraires et Artistiques," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 277-82; "IIIC; La Statistique Internationale des Imprimés," *ibid.*, V, 289-90; Institut International de Statistique *Bull.*, XXIII (1928) 107-10; "Les Éléments de la Statistique Intellectuelle," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930) 363-66; Mentha, Bénique. "La Statistique Internationale des Imprimés," *IID Communicationes*, II:4 (1935).
647. Thompson, L. S. "Suggestions for Statistical Records," *C&RL*, VI (1944/45) 210-18, 322-31; Downs, R. B. "Uniform Statistics for Library Holdings," *LQ*, XVI (1946) 63-69.
648. National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52).

X. EXHIBITS

649. Otlet, *op. cit.* (note 167, first item); IIB, *op. cit.* (note 166, last item); Volkmann, Ludwig. "Der Plan Eines Internationalen Museums in Brüssel," *Archiv für Buchgewerbe*, XLVIII (1911) 1-2.
650. Volkmann, L. "De la Création d'un Musée International des Éditeurs," Int. Cong. Publishers, VIII (Budapest, 1913) *Rapports*, 135-52.
651. Int. Cong. Publishers, VIII (Budapest, 1913) *Compte Rendu*, 62.
652. International Bureau of Education. *Children's Books and International Goodwill*, 2d ed. (Geneva: Bureau International d'Éducation, 1932).
653. Govers, C. "Du Développement du Goût du Beau Livre par l'Organisation

- d'Expositions Itinérantes," Int. Cong. Publishers, X (Brussels, 1933) *Rapports*, 219-25.
654. "International Youth Book Exhibit at Munich," *PubW*, CL (1946) 997-99.
655. "Report of the Special Committee on the Participation of the ALA in the International Exposition of the Book Industry and Graphic Arts, 1914," *ALA Bull.*, VIII (1914) 117-19.
656. "A Book Week Interchange," *PubW*, CXLVI (1944) 719.
657. Bemporad, Enrico. "Journées et Semaines du Livre, Foires et Expositions Internationales du Livre," Int. Cong. Publishers, X (Brussels, 1933) *Rapports*, 183-93.
658. "Convention . . ." (note 203); "Convention Concernant les Échanges Artistiques entre le Brésil et la République Argentine," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 37 (1934) 59-60.
659. Jürgens, A. [Notes in] *ZfB*, LVII (1940) 434-37, 490; LVIII (1941) 69-70, 224-25; "Centrale Vereeniging voor Openbare Leeszalen en Bibliotheken," *Bibliotheekleven*, XXVI (1941) 85-86.
660. "Svensk Bokutställning i Preussische Staatsbibliothek," *Nordisk Tidskrift för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*, XXIV (1937) 204-6; Jürgens, A. "Berlin SB," *ZfB*, LVI (1939) 381-83.
661. Höfner, C. "Gedanken zum Aufbau einer Spanien-Ausstellung," *ZfB*, LVI (1939) 389-94; Striedl, H. "München SB," *ZfB*, LVI (1939) 268, 443-44.
662. Ludington, *op. cit.* (note 540); *Report . . .* (note 447) 3-4.
663. "Library Co-operation . . ." (note 67); Valle, *op. cit.* (note 490).
664. "The Chinese Exhibition," *The Library and the Museum Therein*, I:11 (September 1924) 1-10.
665. "The German Book Exhibition at Columbia," *LJ*, L (1925) 905-6.
666. "Utställningar med Anledning av Nya Sverigeminnet," *Nordisk Tidskrift för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*, XXV (1938) 275-76.
667. Williams, E. E. "Latin American Book Exhibit," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, XIV (1939/40) 236-37; *Latin American Activities of the ALA* (mimeo., rev. 3 March 1942).
668. Beust, Nora E. "Exhibits of our Neighbor Republics," *LJ*, LXVII (1942) 933-37.
669. Chapin, Clara C. "Books of the Americas," *Pan American Union Bull.*, LXXX (1946) 132-40.
670. "Exhibit of Books and Posters from Argentina and Uruguay," *Record*, II:6 (1946) 23-24; "Books from Argentina and Uruguay Displayed at Library of Congress," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 2901-2; U.S. Department of State. Division of Libraries and Institutes. *Monthly Report, August 1946*.
671. "Ambassador Winant Predicts British-American Cooperation through Books," *PubW*, CXLVII (1945) 1108-9, 1192; "International Book Illustration During Ten Years of Crisis," *PubW*, CL (1946) 1224-26.
672. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. *Yearbook*, X (1921) 69.
673. *Ibid.*, XIX (1930) 98-100.
674. Milam, *op. cit.* (note 199).

675. *Survey of Interchange* . . . (note 545) .
676. Gehner, R. F. "American Printing on Latin American Tour," *PubW*, CXL (1941) 1408; Wheeler, M. "Display of U. S. Bookmaking for Latin America," *PubW*, CXLI (1942) 45-48.
677. "Good Books Travel," *Inter-American Monthly*, I:1 (1942) 42.
678. "U.S. Books Shown in Chile," *PubW*, CXLI (1942) 2205.
679. "United States Information Libraries Abroad," U.S. Department of State *Bull.*, October 2, 1943.
680. U.S. Department of State *Cultural Institute Bull.*, April 1944.
681. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 2 October 1944. (mimeo.) 4.
682. [U.S. Office of War Information. Foreign Information Research Division] *Bibliography for the Belgian Exhibit* (mimeo.) .
683. "U.S. University Press Books Shown in London," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 1956.
684. "4,500 Volumes from U.S.A. to Be Shown at Mexican Book Fair," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 2754; Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 13 August 1946 (mimeo.) 5-6.
685. U.S. Department of State. Division of Libraries and Institutes. *Report for July, 1946*.
686. U.S. Department of State . . . *op. cit.* (note 670) .
687. "Inter-American . . ." (note 9) .
688. "USIBA Announces . . ." (note 550) ; "USIBA's French and Swedish Book Exhibits," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 2186-91.
689. "USIBA Opens Book Exhibit in Paris," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 1737.
690. "USIBA's Book Exhibit Enroute to Sweden," *PubW*, CXLIX (1946) 1393-94.
691. "USIBA Announces . . ." (note 550) ; USIBA. *Revised Plan of Mexican Operations* (mimeo., 27 June 1946) .
692. "USIBA, Channel to the World," Authors' League *Bull.*, March 1946.
693. Raney, M. L. "The Decision of Paris," *JDR*, I (1938) 151-61.
694. Power, E. B. [Letter to V. D. Tate] 23 July 1946 (MS) .
695. Roland-Marcel, *op. cit.* (note 493) .
696. Milczewski, M. A. [International Relations Board letter] 8 May 1946 (mimeo.) 9.
697. [Milczewski, M. A. International Relations Board letter] 1 July 1944 (mimeo.) 3.
698. Henshaw, F. H. *Library and Related Films* (mimeo., rev. November 1941) .
699. National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52) .
700. Lord, *op. cit.* (note 234) .
701. Harris, Bertha B. "With Love from Uncle Sam," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 443-44.
702. Heiliger, Edward. "The American Library at Nicaragua," *LJ*, LXX (1945) 663-65.
703. Gropp, A. E. "The American Library Experiment in Uruguay," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 531-34.

704. *America; "A Full and Fair Picture"; The Government's Information and Cultural Relations Program Overseas*, rev. ed. No. 1 (Department of State. Office of Public Affairs, June 1946); U.S. Department of State . . . *op. cit.* (note 468); Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 523); Esman, Sherly G., and Greene, Dorothy E. "Cultural Centers in the Other American Republics," *Record*, 1:8 (1945) 1-6; Hadley, P. E. "United States Cultural Institutes in the Other American Republics," *PubW*, CXLVII (1945) 1552-56.
705. Fabilli, *op. cit.* (note 200); Heindel, R. H. "The American Library Abroad: A Medium of International Intellectual Exchange," *LQ*, XVI (1946) 93-107.
706. *LR*, II:10 (1929) 92.
707. "Bureau of American Bibliography," *CIB Actes*, XII (The Hague-Amsterdam, 1939) 136-37.
708. Heindel, R. H. "A Library in the International Pattern," *LAR*, XLVII (1945) 195-97; Heindel, *op. cit.* (note 488); Little, Evelyn S. "An American Library in London," *ALA Bull.*, XXXVIII (1944) 485-87; also her "A Library Under Fire—London, 1944," *LJ*, LXX (1945) 7-10.
709. Hartwell, W. M. "An American Corner in Bombay," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 879-81; Townes, Mary E. "Relation to the Local Library Profession," *ALA Bull.*, XL (1946) P14-P15; Wilmer, Florence C. "Lessons Learned in Johannesburg," *ALA Bull.*, XL (1946) P16-P18.
710. Poste, L. I. "The American Library in Stuttgart," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 858-62.
711. LA, *op. cit.* (note 448).
712. Warren, Virginia L. "Library in Mexico Now Storm Focus," *New York Times*, 27 October 1946; cf. *Memorandum Presented on Behalf of the Institute of International Education, the American Council on Education, the ALA, and the ACLS* (mimeo., 12 May 1944).
713. Committee for an American Library in Switzerland. [Printed letter] (Basle: n.d.) 13p.

XI. INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONNEL

714. Randall, W. M., and Merritt, L. C. *International Cooperation of American Libraries and Librarians* (MS, 4 February 1942).
715. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. *Yearbook*, XVII (1928) 89-90, XVIII (1929) 90-92, (1930) 98-99, (1931) 107-8, (1934) 70-71, (1936) 83-84.
716. Evans, L. H. [Letter to C. H. Milam] 3 December 1945 (MS).
717. Lydenberg, H. M. [Letter to K. D. Metcalf] 31 May 1946 (MS).
718. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 2).
719. "Comité d'Experts . . ." (note 106).
720. National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52); "Bibliothèques et Archives," *Bull. Coop. Int.*, 1 (1931) 8-9.
721. MacPherson, Harriet D. *Foreign Students at Library Schools of the United States and Canada* (MS, 1946).
722. ALA Board of Education for Librarianship. "Annual Report," *ALA Bull.*, XX (1926) 405-73.

723. Lydenberg, *op. cit.* (note 527).
724. Quattlebaum, *op. cit.* (note 414).
725. Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 523).
726. Benton, *op. cit.* (note 552).
727. Sargent, H. S. [Letter to K. D. Metcalf] 13 September 1946 (MS).
728. Milam, *op. cit.* (note 199); Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
729. Yuan and Fairbank, *op. cit.* (note 369).
730. Ludington, Flora B. [Report on India] (MS, 1946).
731. Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
732. Conference on Foreign Student Problems and Policies, Chicago, April 29-May 1, 1946. *Resolutions Adopted* (mimeo.).
733. MacPherson, *op. cit.* (note 721).
734. Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
735. U.S. Department of State. *For the Press, August 1, 1946* (No. 532—Statement by . . . Benton on the Fulbright Bill, mimeo.).
736. Congrès International de Bibliographie et de Documentation, Bruxelles, 25-27 août 1910. "Résolutions et Vœux," *IIB Bull.*, XV (1910) 79-85.
737. "Réunion Restreinte d'Experts Bibliothécaires" (note 279).
738. Giordani, Igino. "The Vatican Library During Recent Years," *LQ*, VII (1937) 1-25.
739. Hu, T. C. S. "China's First Library School," *LJ*, LIV (1929) 153.
740. MacPherson, *op. cit.* (note 721).
741. Gjelsness, R. H. "Inter-American Collaboration on Education for Librarianship: Bogotá, Quito, Lima," *LQ*, XVI (1946) 187-201; Gropp, A. E. "The School of Library Science at Montevideo, Uruguay," *LJ*, LXIX (1944) 141-43.
742. Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49); Cong. IABCMC, *op. cit.* (note 61) 34.
743. Brown, C. H. *Education for Librarianship in China* (mimeo., 10 April 1946).
744. Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
745. *Latin American Activities* . . . (note 667).
746. Skard, Sigmund. [Letter to H. M. Lydenberg] 27 May 1944 (MS).
747. Lydenberg and Milam, *op. cit.* (note 49).
748. Bishop, W. W. "The Interchange of Librarians, Students and Teachers of Librarianship," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, V, 9-21; "Protocole . . ." (note 397); "International Co-ordination of Archives," *International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation*, 1935 (Paris: IIC, 1936) 71-73.
749. Randall and Merritt, *op. cit.* (note 714).
750. Litton, Gaston. *A Memorandum for the ALA and the Rockefeller Foundation, on the Work of the Commission Appointed to Advise with Officials of the National Library of Brazil* . . . (ALA International Relations Board, February 1946, mimeo.).
751. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. *Yearbook*, XVII (1928) 81-86.

752. Munthe, Wilhelm. *American Librarianship from a European Angle* (Chicago: ALA, 1939).
753. Rothbarth, Margarete. "Conventions et Accords Intellectuels," *Coop. Intel.*, II (1930) 114-18.
754. IIC *Recueil*, 98-101, 158-61 (note 437).
755. Roland-Marcel, *op. cit.* (note 493).
756. Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 748).
757. "Risoluzioni, Sezione 10," World Cong., I (Rome, 1929) *Atti*, I, 176.
758. Bishop, W. W. "Report of the Committee on Exchange of Librarians," CIB *Actes*, III (Stockholm, 1930) 45.
759. Pafford, J. H. "International Library Relations," *LAR*, 4 ser., II (1935) 415-20.
760. *Ibid.*; also Bishop, *op. cit.* (note 748).
761. Coney, Donald. *Foreign Library Service in the War and Postwar Periods* (mimeo., rev. 17 February 1943).
762. Melinat, C. H. *International Library Relations: Selection and Training of Personnel for Foreign Service* (Chicago: ALA, April 1944, mimeo.).
763. Hansen, Agnes C. "Gold in the Foreign Service Roster," *ALA Bull.*, XXXIX (1945) 15-17.
764. Sullivan, Carmel. "The Origin and Development of the Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association," *I-ABR*, I (1941) 5-10.

XII. REHABILITATION

765. Lydenberg, *op. cit.* (note 717); FID, *op. cit.* (note 71).
766. *UNESCO Library* . . . (note 182).
767. *The International Bureau of Education and Post-War Educational Reconstruction* (International Bureau of Education *Publication*, 84, 1944).
768. *Conference of Allied Ministers of Education* (Washington: National Education Association. Office of Public Relations, 5 May 1944, mimeo.).
769. White, C. M., and Welsford, P. S. J. "The Inter-Allied Book Centre in London," *LQ*, XVI (1946) 57-62.
770. *Ibid.*; also Lehmkühl, Dik. "Harvesting Books for the World," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 728-30; and Turner, R. E. *Assistance for the Educational Reconstruction of the Liberated Countries* (mimeo.).
771. Kefauver, G. N., and White, C. M. "The Library Situation in Europe," *LJ*, LXX (1945) 385-89, 473-76.
772. Bishop, W. W. *Memorandum—Aid to Libraries in War Areas* (mimeo., 4 May 1944).
773. ALA, *op. cit.* (note 370).
774. U.S. Department of State. *For the Press, March 31, 1944* (No. 100).
775. Comins, Dorothy J. "American Journals for Foreign Libraries," *LJ*, LXXI (1946) 1088-93; also Wright, W. E., and Comins, Dorothy J. *Report to the Rockefeller Foundation on the Periodicals Project of the ALA's Committee*

- on Aid to Libraries in War Areas, for the Year Ending December 31, 1945* (mimeo., 17 June 1946).
776. Lydenberg, H. M. "The Library Rehabilitation Programme of the ALA," *JDoc*, I (1945/46) 72-78.
777. Milczewski, *op. cit.* (note 696) 3.
778. Shaffer, K. R. *The American Book Center for War Devastated Libraries, Inc.* (mimeo., 28 June 1945).
779. Shaffer, K. R. *The American Book Center for War Devastated Libraries, Inc.* (mimeo., 1 April 1946).
780. White and Welsford, *op. cit.* (note 769).
781. Thompson, Lawrence. *Rehabilitation of Research Libraries on the European Continent* (MS, 21 March 1944).
782. Turner, *op. cit.* (note 770).
783. UNESCO Library . . . (note 182).
784. UNESCO Preparatory Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 165).
785. ALA International Relations Board, *op. cit.* (note 456) 12.
786. Conference of German Library Directors . . . *op. cit.* (note 451).
787. LA, *op. cit.* (note 448).
788. National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52).
789. Besterman, *op. cit.* (note 361).
790. White, C. M. [Letter to MacLeish] 8 March 1945 (MS).
791. National Commission . . . *op. cit.* (note 52).
792. Williams, E. E. *International Library Relations—A General Survey of Possible Postwar Library Development* (Chicago: ALA, 1943, mimeo.).
793. LA, *op. cit.* (note 448).
794. Lydenberg, H. M. [International Relations Board letter] 1 December 1945 (mimeo.) 5-6.
795. Donker Duyvis, F. [Letter of 13 December 1945 to FID Council] (MS).
796. Milczewski, *op. cit.* (note 360) 3; cf. Brown, C. H. [Letter of 5 November 1945, to all college and university librarians interested] (mimeo.).
797. Metcalf, K. D. [Letter to MacLeish] 1 November 1944 (MS).
798. Thompson, *op. cit.* (note 781).
799. Shairer, Gerda. *Women's Council for Post-War Europe Inc. Plan for the Establishment of a Circulating Library Service in the Liberated Countries of Europe* (MS, 1944).
800. Milam, C. H. [Letter to G. N. Kefauver] 17 December 1945 (MS).
801. UNESCO Library . . . (note 182).
802. Milczewski, M. A. [International Relations Board letter] 28 March 1946 (MS).

AGENCIES AND PRIORITIES

803. Good general accounts are Breycha-Vauthier, A. C. de. "The Federation of Library Associations," in *William Warner Bishop, A Tribute*, ed. by H. M. Lydenberg and Andrew Keogh (New Haven: Yale, 1941) 34-49; "Institut

CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES

International de Documentation; Description Historique Sommaire," IID *Communicationes*, IV:2 (1937) 7-13; and Donker Duyvis, *op. cit.* (note 116). Thomson, C. A. "The Emerging Program of Cultural Relations," *ALA Bull.*, XXXVIII (1944) 75-81; Hanson, *op. cit.* (note 523).

Cf. note 712.

Bishop, W. W. *The Future of the *A.L.A. International Relations Board* (MS, 7 June 1946); Milczewski, M. A. *The International Relations Board, A Preliminary Statement to Serve as a Basis of a Report on its Past and Present Work and its Future* (MS, 4 June 1946).



Abbreviations

- ABC—American Book Center
ACLS—American Council of Learned Societies
ACRL—Association of College and Reference Libraries
ADI—American Documentation Institute
AetB—Archives et Bibliothèques
ALA—American Library Association
ALI—American Library Institute
ARL—Association of Research Libraries
ASLIB—Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux
BSIB—British Society for International Bibliography
Bull.—Bulletin
Bull. Coop. Int.—Bulletin de la Coopération Intellectuelle
Bull. des Rel. Sci.—Bulletin des Relations Scientifiques
C&CYbk—Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook
C&RL—College and Research Libraries
CBI—Cumulative Book Index
CIB—Comité International des Bibliothèques; International Library Committee
Conf.—Conference
Cong. Bib. Int.—Congrès Bibliographique International
Cong. IABCMC—Congreso Internacional de Archiveros, Bibliotecarios y Conservadores de Museos del Caribe
Cong. Int. Arch. B.—Congrès International des Archivistes et des Bibliothécaires
Cong. Int. Bib. & AL—Congrès International des Bibliothécaires et des Amis du Livre; International Congress of Librarians and Bibliophiles
Cong. Mond.—Congrès Mondial de la Documentation Universelle; World Congress of Universal Documentation
Coop. Intel.—Coopération Intellectuelle
ed.—edition, editor, edited by
FID—Fédération Internationale de Documentation; International Federation for Documentation
GPO—United States Government Printing Office
I-AB&LA—Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association

IABC—Inter-Allied Book Centre

I-ABR—Inter-American Bibliographical Review

ICIC—International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation

IFLA—International Federation of Library Associations; Fédération Internationale des Associations des Bibliothécaires

IIB—Institut International de Bibliographie (became International Federation for Documentation)

IID—Institut International de Documentation (became International Federation for Documentation)

IIIC—International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation; Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle

IIIC UIO—University Information Office

Int. Conf. Doc.—International Conference on Documentation

Int. Cong. Publishers—International Congress of Publishers; International Publishers Congress; Congrès International des Éditeurs

Int. Lib. Conf.—International Library Conference

J.—Journal

JDoc—Journal of Documentation

JDR—Journal of Documentary Reproduction

LA—Library Association

LAR—Library Association Record

LC—Library of Congress

LJ—Library Journal

LQ—Library Quarterly

LR—Library Review

mimeo.—mimeographed

MS—manuscript

n.d.—no date

n.p.—no publisher

n.s.—new series

PMLA—Publications of the Modern Language Association of America

PNLA—Pacific Northwest Library Association

Proc.—Proceedings

PubW—Publishers' Weekly

P-V et Mém.—Procès-Verbaux et Mémoires

RdB—Revue des Bibliothèques

RdL&B—Revue du Livre et des Bibliothèques

Record—The Record (U.S. Department of State—Scientific and Cultural Cooperation)

Recueil—International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation: Recueil des Accords Intellectuels (Paris: IIIC, 1938)

Rep.—Report

rev.—revised

ser.—series

tr.—translated

Trans.—*Transactions*

UDC—Universal Decimal Classification; Classification Décimale Universelle

ULS—*Union List of Serials*

UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

USIBA—United States International Book Association

World Cong.—World Congress of Libraries and Bibliography

YWL—*Years Work in Librarianship*

ZfB—*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*

Index

- Abbreviations, 10, 19
 Abstracting and indexing, xvi-xvii, 17-33, 48, 52, 70, 148
 Accessions lists, 39
 Acquisition, cooperative, 55-66, 70, 106.
 See also Specialization
 Acquisitions studies, 61-62, 65, 67-68, 132
 Addressograph, 19
 Adrema-Machine, 19
 Agencies. *See* Centres
 Agreements. *See* Specialization; Treaties
 Akademischer Tauschverein, 83
 Allocation: of documents, 77-79, 82; of European acquisitions, 62; of exchange materials, 91-94; of gifts for rehabilitation, xviii, 145-147, 150-151; of students, 137; of theses, 86; *See also* Specialization
 Alphabetization, 10
 American Bibliographical Society, 60
 American Book Center, xviii, 88, 90, 92-97, 146-147, 150, 152-154
 American Council of Learned Societies, 24, 30, 46, 52, 61, 102, 136, 159
 American Council on Education, 152
 American Documentation Institute, xx, 24, 44, 48, 102, 141, 159
 American Historical Association, 60
American Imprints Inventory, xvii
 American Institute of Graphic Arts, 126-127
 American libraries abroad. *See* Libraries abroad
 American Library Association, xiii, xvi-xx, 4-5, 8-10, 15, 18, 35-37, 44-45, 50, 53, 55-56, 60-61, 63, 76, 79, 82, 87, 90, 94-95, 100-104, 106, 114-115, 118, 122, 125-132, 135, 137-142, 145-146, 148, 156, 159
 American Library Institute, 8, 19, 36, 59-60
 American National Commission . . . *See* National Commission . . .
 American National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, 116
 American Standards Association, 19
 American Textbook Publishers Institute, 102, 104
 Analytics, 19, 47
 Archives, xvii, 46, 57
 Archivists, 135
 Argentina, 74-75, 104, 126, 131
 Association des Bibliothécaires Suisses, 40
 Association Internationale des Académies, 35
 Association of American Universities, 91
 Association of American University Presses, 91
 Association of College and Reference Libraries, 37, 89, 156
 Association of Research Libraries, xvi-xviii, xx, 61, 65-66, 68-69, 79, 114-115, 123, 156, 158-159
 Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux, 19, 106
 Association of University Teachers, 36
 Associations, library (in general), xv-xvi, 14, 19, 22, 38, 91, 130, 156-157
 Australia, 15, 74, 139
 Austria, 35-36, 40, 75, 101, 110, 132
 Author bibliography. *See* Catalogues; Cataloguing; Lists; National bibliography; Selective bibliography; Union catalogues; Union lists
 Author entries, 10, 14
 Authors: abstracts by, 19, 28; copyright and, 116-117; royalties of, 101, 103, 121, 149
 Auxiliary publication, 48-49

- Balkan nations, 101
 Barriers: fiscal, 103-104, 122-123, 132; study of, xix, 121-123; tariff, xix, 40, 103, 110-111, 121-123; to loan, 39-41; to personnel exchange, 139-140; *See also* Copyright; Postage
 Belgian exchange service, 73, 76, 84, 87
 Belgium, 7, 74, 112, 117, 121, 125
 Berne Convention, 113, 115-117
 Bibliographical centres, 19, 21-25, 43, 50, 59
 Bibliographical Guide to American Library Resources, xvii, 8-9
 Bibliographies: exchange of, 23; interruption by war of, 148, 150; mechanical production of, 49; unpublished, 19; *See also* Lists
 Bibliography: author (*See* Catalogues; Cataloguing; Lists; National bibliography; Selective bibliography; Union catalogues; Union lists); importance of, 3, 155; institutes of, 24, 76, 86; microprint, 20, 47-48; national (*See* National bibliography); of bibliography, 19, 23; of documents, xv-xvi, 7, 25; of library literature in translation, 137; of translations, xix, 101-102, 106-107; retrospective, xv, 6, 11, 26, 31; selective (*See* Selective bibliography); subject, xvi-xviii, 5, 7-10, 16-33, 39, 47-49, 52, 61, 68-70, 148; universal or world, 5, 24-25
Bibliography of Agriculture, 23, 27, 30
 Biblioteca Benjamin Franklin, 105, 127, 129
 Bibliothèque Nationale, 39, 83, 87, 111, 114
Biological Abstracts, 27-28, 31-33, 52
 Bloom bill, xviii, 96, 142-143
 Bolivia, 74
 Boni project, 46
 Book: prices, 103-104; production statistics, 6-7, 12, 118-119; production surveys, 61-62, 67-68; selection (*See* Selective bibliography); trade, xix, 71, 96, 100-108, 110-111, 121-123, 132, 137, 150, 154
 Book days and weeks, 125
 Book Foundation, Inc., 102
 Book Publishers Bureau, 102, 104, 117
Booklist, 5
 Books for Europe and Books for Latin America projects, 90, 127
 Boone Library School, 138
 Börsenverein, 103, 106, 126
 Boxer indemnity, 136
 Boyd proposal, xx, 157-159
 Brazil, 74-75, 90, 139
British Book News, 103
 British Council, 4, 87, 103, 106, 125, 129
 British libraries abroad, 129
 British manuscript project, 46, 52
 British Museum, 6, 9, 34, 52, 111, 145
 British Publications Foundation, 148
 British Publishers Association, 106
 Brown University, 48
 Brussels Conference: (1895), 5, 20; (1897), 4; (1910), 138
 Brussels Convention, 74-77, 84, 86
 Buenos Aires Convention, 75, 136
 Bulgaria, 40, 100-101, 139
 Bureau Météorologique International, 23
 Bureau of American Bibliography, 129
 Bureaux. *See* Centres
 Bush machine, 26, 49-50
 Buying, cooperative, 55-66, 70, 106
 Calendar of expositions, 125
 California, University of, 15, 80, 82, 85
 Cambridge University Press, 127
 Cameras, 49, 51
 Card: bibliographies, 5, 23; encyclopedias, 49
 Cards: exchange of, 8, 10, 90-91; issued by publishers, 10, 19, 46; microprint, 20, 47-48, 51; punched, 10, 26, 49; *See also* Catalogues
 Carnegie Corporation of New York, xiii, 44, 55, 152
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 90, 126, 135
 Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, 36
 Catalogue cards. *See* Cards
Catalogue of Copyright Entries, xvi, 6-7
 Catalogues: copying of, 49; exhibit of, 126; interruption by war of, 148; printed, 6, 9; publication of subject, xvii, 28, 31, 69-70; union (*See* Union catalogues)
 Cataloguing: 10, 16-17, 28; centralized, 22, 56, 61; cooperative, xiii, 10, 17; rules, 10, 14
Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiae, 7
 Censorship, 111
 Central libraries, 57, 150
 Centralized processing, 22, 56, 61
 Centres: abstract collection, 29, 32; bibliographical, 19, 21-25, 43, 50, 59; commercial order, 104; cultural, 4, 127, 129; deposit (regional), 57, 112; distribution (for rehabilitation materials), 145-147, 151-152; document exchange, 73-82, 90, 152; duplicate, 83-84, 88-90, 92-96, 152,

- 154; exchange, xviii, 39, 70, 73-80, 84-99, 110, 152-154; information, 35, 38-39, 86, 90, 129; loan, 37-42, 50, 86, 113; purchasing, 55-66, 70, 106; reproduction negative and request, xvii, 43-45, 53; serials, 21, 150; specialization program, 59, 61; thesis distribution, 86; translation information, 102, 104
- Chemical Abstracts*, 27, 32
- Chicago, University of, 60, 128
- Children's Book Week, 125
- Children's books, 91, 102, 124
- Children's Library Association, 102
- Chile, 74, 127
- China, 57, 59, 74, 89, 121, 128, 151
- Chinese: library schools, 138; library survey, 139; publications (acquisition of and specialization in), 56-57, 63, 70, 87, 91; students, 135-136; translations, 102
- Cinema. *See* Motion pictures
- Classed catalogues, xvii, 7-9, 16, 28, 31, 61, 68-70
- Classification: Farmington plan, 61, 66-67; indexing and abstracting, 20, 26; library, 17; standardization of, 20-22
- Clearinghouses. *See* Centres
- Collecting practices, fair, 60-61
- College libraries, 38, 55-56, 82, 87, 130, 152
- Colombia, 74
- Colonial editions, 104
- Columbia University, 99, 126, 135
- Comité International des Bibliothèques, 10, 36, 38, 75, 135, 139
- Commercial exchanges, xix, 71, 96, 100-108, 110-111, 121-123, 132, 137, 150, 154
- Commercium Literarium, 83
- Commission for International Educational Reconstruction, 142, 152-153
- Commissions: national exchange, 73; national library, 145-147, 151
- Committee for the Study of Copyright, 116
- Committee of Experts in Biology, 23
- Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning, xvii, 44-46, 50, 53, 115
- Compagnie Française Thomson-Houston, 51
- Compulsory licensing, 116-118, 149
- Concilium Bibliographicum, 23
- Conférence Internationale pour les Échanges . . . , 74
- Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, 144-145
- Conference of German Library Directors, 87, 147
- Conference on Bibliography and the Concentration of Research Materials in the Field of Latin American Studies, 60
- Conference on Foreign Student Problems and Policies, 137
- Conferences: library (in general), 130, 134, 135, 139, 141; scientific, 32
- Congrès International des Bibliothécaires et des Amis du Livre, 24, 36, 75, 86, 118, 135
- Congrès Mondial... *See* World Congress...
- Congreso de Bibliotecarios, 110, 135
- Congreso Internacional de Archiveros, Bibliotecarios y Conservadores de Museos del Caribe, 109
- Congresses. *See* Conferences
- Consular invoices, xix, 123
- Conventions. *See* Conferences; Treaties
- Cooperative: acquisition, 55-66, 70, 106 (*See also* Specialization); cataloguing, xiii, 10, 17
- Copying. *See* Microfilm; Photographic Reproduction
- Copyright: xix, 108, 111, 113-123; and rehabilitation, 120-121, 148-149; and reproduction, xix, 46, 114-115, 120, 123; deposit, 5-7, 15, 83-84, 111-113, 115, 119-120
- Costa Rica, 74
- Costs: of abstracting, 27, 30, 31; of books and serials, 103-105; of comprehensive acquisitions, 62; of exchange, 89, 98-99; of international conferences, 135; of loan, 40; of reproduction, xvii, 44-46, 49-50, 52-53
- Council of National Library Associations, 61, 119, 146
- Councils: national, 86; research, 22
- Credit regulations, 103
- Critical bibliography. *See* Selective bibliography
- Cuba, 75
- Cultural: centres, 4, 127, 129; institutes, 9, 38-39, 129; looting, 61, 145-146, 148; relations bill, xviii, 96, 142-143
- Cultural Institutions Round Table, 9, 25, 102, 117, 128
- Cumulative Book Index*, xvi, 6-7, 11, 14
- Currency restrictions, 103-104, 122-123, 132
- Customs, *See* Tariff
- Czechoslovakia, 40, 74-75, 100, 117, 150
- Danzig, 74
- Decimal classification, 20-22
- Delegates at conferences, 135
- Demonstrations, 125-126, 128, 150

- Denmark, 112, 115, 135
 Deposit, copyright or legal, 5-7, 15, 83-84, 111-113, 115, 119-120
 Desiderata lists, xvi, 86, 88-89, 92, 94
 Deutsche Bücherei, 6, 112
 Deutsche Gemeinschaft zur Erhaltung und Förderung der Forschung, 87
 Dewey classification, 20-22
 Diazo, 50
 Diplomatic transmission of loans, 37
 Directories, library, 118
 Dissertations, 48, 85-86
 Documentation: meaning of term, 158; services, 22, 39
 Documents: allocation and distribution, xvii-xviii, 75-82; bibliography, xv-xvi, 7, 25; exchange, 73-82, 90, 152; for rehabilitation, 145; Indian, 15; postage on, 80; specialization in, xvii-xviii, 67, 76-78; state and local, xvi, 76-77, 80-82; tariff on, 110; translation of, 102
 Documents Expediter, 79-80, 94
 Dominican Republic, 74
 Droit de suite, 117
 Duke University, 59, 76
 Duplicates exchange, 83-84, 88-90, 92-96, 152, 154
 Duplication: in abstracting, 18, 20-21, 24, 28, 30-33; in publishing projects, 58, 148; in purchases (*See* Specialization); *See also* Photographic reproduction
 Duties. *See* Tariff
 Edifices of civilization, 124
 "Educational," 158
 Edwards Brothers, 51, 53
 Egypt, 75
 Embassies, 80, 102, 105, 127, 129
 Encyclopedias, 49
 Enemy countries, former, xix
 Engineering Index, 23
 Exchange: centres, xviii, 39, 70, 73-80, 84-99, 110, 152-154; commercial, xix, 71, 96, 100-108, 110-111, 121-123, 132, 137, 150, 154; commissions, 73; lists (*See* Lists); of abstracts, 31, 33; of academic publications, xviii, 71, 83-99, 105, 154; of bibliography proof-sheets, 23; of catalogue cards, 8, 10, 90-91; of copyright deposit, 83-84, 112; of documents, 73-82, 90, 152; of duplicates, 83-84, 88-90, 92-96, 152, 154; of exhibits, 125; of film orders, 44; of fragments, 83, 89; of librarians, xviii-xix, 134-143, 149; of lists of works recommended for translation, 101; of microfilm, 9, 91, 98; of museum materials, 73; of national bibliographies, 6, 75; of positions, 139-140; of stereotype plates, 9; of students, 136-137; of theses, 85-86; pairing of libraries for, 87, 152; postage on, 91, 98-99, 109-110; post-war, 63, 147, 149; principles of, 72; rates of, 103-104, 122-123, 132; statistics of, 75; study of, xviii, 87, 91, 96; transmission, xviii, 70, 73-76, 84-85, 91-93, 98-99; treaties, 73-79, 84, 86, 92
 Exhibits, xix, 124-132
 Exports, 96, 103-106; *See also* Imports
 Expositions, 125
 Facsimile, reduced. *See* Photographic reproduction
 Fair use, 114, 120
 Farmington plan, xvii-xviii, 11, 32, 58-70, 77, 82, 92, 106, 113, 132, 152, 156
 Federal Government libraries, 63, 67
 Fédération Internationale de Documentation: xx, 5, 10, 13-14, 19-20, 23-24, 35, 37, 39-40, 43, 45, 49, 53, 109, 118, 124, 134-135, 141, 144, 148, 155, 159; conferences: (1895), 5, 20; (1897), 4; (1900), 5; (1910), 138; (1938), 51
 Fellowships, 135-138, 140-142, 146
 Film strips, 51
 Fiscal barriers, 103-104, 122-123, 132
 Foire Internationale du Livre, 125
 Folkeboksamlingenes Ekspedisjon, 56
 Foreign: service, xix, 140-142; students, 135-138, 140-142, 146
 Foundations (in general), 31, 46, 49, 136, 157
 Fragments, exchange of, 83, 89
 France, 5, 35-36, 58, 111, 115, 117, 125, 147; *See also* French
 Franking. *See* Postage
 Free trade. *See* Tariff
 Freedom of information, xix, 41, 121-123
 French exchanges, 73, 83-84, 86-87, 91, 97
 French Information Service, 68
 Fulbright bill, 138
 Gentlemen's agreement, xix, 114-115, 120, 123
 German: bibliographical services, 25, 27-28, 30, 148; exchanges, 84, 86-87, 89, 93; publishers, 6, 103, 106, 112, 126; serials, 14, 54, 105; union catalogue, 7, 36, 39, 58
 Germany: xix, 6, 14, 36, 41, 58, 65, 75, 97, 101, 103, 114, 125, 143, 147-149; U.S. Military Government in, 124, 129, 133, 143
 Gesamtkatalog, 7, 36, 39, 58

- Gifts, 72, 90, 92, 102, 152
 Governmental subsidies. *See* Subsidies
 Grants: for study and travel, 137-138; foundation, 8, 31, 46, 49, 51, 90, 128-129, 136, 138, 140, 146, 156-157 (*See also* Carnegie); *See also* Subsidies
 Great Britain, 5-7, 11, 36, 39-40, 57, 59, 82-84, 87, 89, 103-105, 111, 114-115, 125-126, 129, 135, 144-145; *See also* British Greece, 87, 101
 Harmon Foundation, 128
 Harvard University, xiii, 19, 35, 46, 60, 112
 Havana Conference, 4
 Hawkins scientific list, 4
 Hayden Memorial Library, 93
 House organs, xvi
 Hungarian: exchange service, 76, 86-87; publications survey, 67-68
 Hungary, 7, 36, 75, 94, 100-101, 110
 Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 102
 Iceland, 103
 Immigration restrictions, 139-140
 Imports: copyright and, 116-117; encouragement by publishers of, 96, 103-106; invoices for, xix, 123; tariff on, xix, 103, 110-111, 121-123
Index Bibliographicus, 19
Index Translationum, 101, 106-107
 Indexing and abstracting, xvi-xvii, 17-33, 48, 52, 70, 148
 India, 15, 71, 136
 Information: access to and freedom of, xix, 41, 121-123; centres, 35, 38-39, 86, 90, 129
 Institut International de Bibliographie. *See* Fédération Internationale de Documentation
 Institut International de Collaboration Philosophique, 23, 43-44
 Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle, 4, 19, 22-24, 36-37, 40, 43-44, 47, 74-75, 92, 100-101, 109-110, 112-113, 118, 135, 138
 Institut International de Documentation. *See* Fédération Internationale de Documentation
 Institut International de Statistique, 118
 Institute of International Education, 136-137
 Institutes: cultural, 9, 38-39, 129; of bibliography, 24, 76, 86
 Instituto Cultural Argentino-Norte Americano, 127
 Instituto Nacional do Livro, 90
 Instructors in librarianship, 138
 Inter-Allied Book Centre, 90, 144-145, 147, 150
 Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association, 109, 141
 Inter-American Book Exchange, 4, 103, 128
 Inter-American Conference (1936), 109
 Inter-American Conference on Copyright, 117, 119
 Interlibrary loans, xvii, 9, 34-46, 50, 52, 57-58, 60, 86, 89, 110, 113, 120, 130, 147
 International American Conference (1928), 4
 International Bureau of Education, 124, 142, 144
International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, 20, 22
 International clearinghouse of publications (proposed), 90, 94
 International Committee of Historical Sciences, 23
 International Committee of Intellectual Rights, 114
 International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, 3
 International Conferences on Documentation, 4-5, 20, 51, 134, 138
 International conferences or congresses (in general), 32, 130, 134-135, 139, 141
 International Congress of Librarians and Bibliophiles, 24, 36, 75, 86, 118, 135
 International Congress of Publishers, 5, 20, 101-102, 110, 112-114, 124
 International copyright, 113, 115-118, 121
 International Federation for Documentation. *See* Fédération Internationale de Documentation
 International Federation of Library Associations: 23-24, 37-38, 135, 141, 144, 155; Comité International des Bibliothèques, 10, 36, 38, 75, 135, 139; Madrid Congress, 36-37, 75, 101; Rome Congress, 5, 10, 19-20, 22-23, 37, 40, 75, 86, 101, 109-110, 113, 118, 126, 139
 International Geographical Congress, 73
 International houses, 137-138
 International Institute of Agriculture, 20, 23, 39
 International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, 4, 19, 22-24, 36-37, 40, 43-44, 47, 74-75, 92, 100-101, 109-110, 112-113, 118, 135, 138
 International libraries, 23-26, 41, 113
 International Library Committee, 10, 36, 38, 75, 135, 139

- International Museum of the Book, 124
 International Publishers Congress, 5, 20, 101-102, 110, 112-114, 124
 International Translation Office, 102
 International . . . *See also* World . . .
 Internship, 138-140, 142
 Inventory. *See* Surveys
 Invoices, consular, xix, 123
 Iran, 103
 Istituto Italiano del Libro, 125
 Italy, 11, 35-36, 75, 100-101, 110, 125
- Japan, xix, 63, 70-71, 117
 John Carter Brown Library, 132
 Joint Committee on Books for Devastated and Other Libraries, 146
 Joint Committee on Indexing and Abstracting, 22, 24
 Joint Committee on Materials for Research, xix, 53, 114-115, 120, 123
 Joint Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning, xvii, 44-46, 50, 53, 115
 Joint Foreign Trade Committee, 104
Journal of Documentary Reproduction, 44
 Journals, official, 74
 Journées du livre, 125
 Junior colleges, 55-56
- Laboratories, microphotography, 49-51
 Language barriers, 13-14, 32-33, 137-141;
See also Translation
 Latin America, 4, 6, 11, 15, 76, 141
 Latin American: commercial relations, 103-106; copyright, 116; documents, 73; exchanges, 85, 87, 89-91, 96-97; exhibits, 126-127; library schools, 138; materials (specialization in), 6, 57, 60; postal agreement, 80; students, 136-137; translations, 6, 57, 60, 101-102; union catalogues, 8-9; visits, 103, 138-139
 Latvia, 74
 Law Library Association, 89
 League of Nations: 3, 6, 77, 105; International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, 4, 19, 22-24, 36-37, 40, 43-44, 47, 74-75, 92, 100-101, 109-110, 112-113, 118, 135, 138
 Legal deposit, 5-7, 15, 83-84, 111-113, 115, 119-120
 Legations, 68
 Legislative action, summaries of, 75
 Lending libraries, international, 41
 Liberia, 74
 Librarians: exchange of, xviii-xix, 134-143, 149; library for, 126
 Librarianship, schools of, 68, 134-142, 156
 Libraries: central, 57, 150; circulating (in liberated areas), 150; college, 38, 55-56, 82, 87, 130, 152; Federal Government, 63, 67; international, 23-26, 41, 113; national, xiii, 4-5, 14, 21-22, 24-26, 38, 54, 76, 86, 111, 113, 147; public, 55, 130-131, 150, 156; state, 112; subject, 23-26, 113; theological, 60; traveling, 126; universal, 24, 47, 112
 Libraries abroad, xix, 4, 38, 57, 84, 90, 105, 127-130, 132, 138; documents for, xviii, 76-77, 80-81; loans by, 36, 41-42; personnel in, 140-142; survey of, xx, 130, 132-133
 Library: associations (in general), xv-xvi, 14, 19, 22, 38, 91, 130, 156-157; catalogues and cataloguing (*See* Catalogues; Cataloguing); centres (World), 23, 25; classification, 17; conferences (in general), 130, 134-135, 139, 141; demonstrations, 125-126, 128, 150; developments (proposed book on), 150; directories, 118; facilities (access to), 145; for librarians, 126; literature, 23, 102, 137; schools, 68, 134-142, 156; services (coordination of), 147; surveys (*See* Surveys); terminology, 118, 138
 Library Association (British), 7, 59, 106, 117, 129, 135, 145, 148
 Library Association of China, 56
 Library of Congress, xiii, xvi-xx, 4, 6-11, 13-15, 22, 24, 30-31, 35, 38-39, 41, 45, 47-50, 54, 59-66, 68-71, 76-82, 84, 87-88, 91, 96-97, 112-113, 119-120, 126, 131, 141, 143, 146, 152, 155-156, 158-159
Library Quarterly, 150
 Licensing, 116-118, 149
 Lima meeting (1938), 116
 Lisbon Convention, 105
 Lists: microreproduction of, 89; of accessions (union), 39; of American documents sent abroad, xviii, 80-82; of American Zone publications, 97; of "approved" serials, 18; of desiderata, xvi, 86, 88-89, 92, 94; of documentation services, 22, 39; of documents for exchange, 73-77; of duplicates for exchange, 88-89, 152; of exchange centres, 92; of films, 128; of indexing and abstracting services, xvi, 30; of institutions in Germany, 93; of manuscript reproductions, 44; of microfilm, 44-45; of organizations in subject fields, 22; of organizations working with students, 137; of photographic reproduction services, 44; of rehabilitation

- materials, 153-154; of serials for exchange, xvi, 75, 80, 84, 86-88, 92, 94-95, 97; of serials holdings (wartime), xvi, 54; of serials indexed, xvi, 30; of serials, national, 67; of serials, subject, 16; of serials, union, 9, 14-16, 39, 58, 60, 89; of theses, 86; of translations, xix, 101-102, 106-107, 137; of translators, 101; of work in progress, 23; of works recommended for translation, 101-102, 106; *See also* Bibliographies; Bibliography
- Loan, xvii, 9, 34-46, 50, 52, 57-58, 60, 86, 89, 110, 113, 120, 130, 147
- Local documents xvi, 76-77, 80-82
- London, American Library in, 129
- Loose-leaf encyclopedias, 49
- Looting, cultural, 61, 145-146, 148
- McCombs list, 4
- Madrid Congress, 36-37, 75, 101
- Maison de la Chimie, 23
- Managua, American Library in, 127, 129
- Manuscripts: common law protection of, 115; copying of, 44, 46, 52; union catalogue of, 7-8
- Massachusetts, 112
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 50
- Mechanical brains and sorting, 10, 19-20, 26, 49
- Medical Library Association, 89, 152
- Mexico, 10, 75, 125-127, 135
- Mexico, University of, 105
- Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, 102, 104
- Michigan, University of, 85, 93
- Microbibliography and microcards, 20, 47-48, 51
- Microfilm: centres and lists, 44-45; exchanges, 9, 91, 98; exhibits, 128; for bibliographical purposes, 25, 49, 89; laboratories, 49-51; orders, 44, 46; publication, 51; readers, 46, 48, 50-52; world library on, 47; *See also* Photographic reproduction
- Microprint, 46-49
- Middle East Journal*, 70
- Monaco, 75
- Montevideo, American Library and Library School in, 129, 138
- Monthly Checklist of State Publications*, xvi
- Moral rights, 116-117
- Morgan Library, 126
- Morocco, 75
- Motion pictures: copyright revision and, 116-117; deposit of, 113; listing of, xvi; on libraries, 128, 130
- Municipal documents, xvi
- Museum exchanges, 73
- Museum of the Book, International, 124
- Music, 116, 119
- National Association of Book Publishers, xix, 106, 114-115, 120, 123
- National bibliography: xv-xvi, 5-7, 11-16, 22; coordination of world subject bibliography with, 24-26; deposit for, 5-7, 111, 113; exchange of, 6, 75; listing of translations in, 101, 107
- National Book Recovery Council, 145
- National Central Library, 7, 36, 57, 87, 129
- National Commission on Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation: xvi, xix-xx, 107, 122, 148, 157-159; Cultural Institutions Round Table, 9, 25, 102, 117, 128
- National commissions or councils of librarians, 86, 145-147, 151
- National Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Authority, xx, 157-159
- National libraries, xiii, 4-5, 14, 21-22, 24-26, 38, 54, 76, 86, 111, 113, 147
- National Library Authority, xx, 158
- National Library Council, 57
- National Research Council: 4, 102, 136, 159; Committee on Scientific Aids to Learning, xvii, 44-46, 50, 53, 115
- Netherlands, 53, 76, 84, 114, 125
- Netherlands Indies, 122
- Network, universal bibliographical, 24
- New York Public Library, 19, 34, 126
- New Zealand, 139
- Newark Public Library, 126
- Newspapers: filming of, 46, 50; listing of, xv; specialization in, 59; subscriptions to, 105
- North Carolina, University of, 59, 76
- Norway, 10, 56, 135, 138-139
- Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft, 58, 87, 147
- Obstacles. *See* Barriers
- Office Central des Institutions Internationales, 24
- Office International de Chimie, 22-23, 43
- Offices. *See* Centres
- Official journals, 74
- Offset. *See* Photographic reproduction
- Ontario Department of Education, 55

- Oregon State Library, 55
 Organizations in subject fields, xvii, 22-24, 26, 57, 88, 148
 Oxford Congress, 51
 Oxford University, 7, 111, 127
- Pacific Northwest Library Association, 59
 Pairing of libraries, 87, 152
 Pamphlets: xv, 6, 15, 71; for students and schools, 137
 Pan American copyright agreement, 117
 Pan American Union, 8, 39, 87, 126
 Paper, 46, 77, 103, 105-106, 113
 Paraguay, 74
 Paris, American Library in, 41, 84, 129, 138
 Paris Congress: (1900), 5; (1923), 59
 Parliamentary annals, 74
 Peace treaties, 148
 Peiping, National Library in, 91, 102
 Periodicals. *See* Serials
 Periodicals Exchange Union, 89
 Personal relationships, 95
 Personnel: exchange of, xviii-xix, 134-143, 149; publishing, 102
 Peru, 74
 Philadelphia Bibliographical Center, 15, 44-45, 49
 Philippines, 80, 93, 142, 151
 Photographic reproduction: xvii, 32, 34, 38, 41, 43-53, 77, 93, 120, 130; bibliographical uses of, 10, 19-20, 49; copyright on, xix, 46, 114-115, 120, 123; demand for, xvii, 52-53, 148-150; for rehabilitation, 51, 120-121, 147-149; *See also* Microfilm
 Photographs, 125-126, 128, 130
 Photostat, 43
 Pocket Books, 103
 Poland, 53, 74, 100-101, 112, 139
 Poole's *Index*, 19
 Portugal, 74
 Positions, exchange of, 139-140
 Postage: 80, 105, 110; on exchanges, 91, 98-99, 109-110; on loans, 37-38, 40, 110
 Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, 105
 Prague Congress, 24, 36, 75, 86, 118, 135
 Presses, university, 85, 91, 96, 127
 Preussische Staatsbibliothek, 36, 93
 Prices. *See* Costs
 Princeton University, xiii, 60, 157
 Printers, 111, 113, 115
 Priorities. *See* Allocation
 Processed publications, 25, 78
 Processing, centralized, 22, 56, 61
 Procurement officers, 63, 68, 81, 88, 106
 Proposal for a division of responsibility . . . *See* Farmington plan
 Prussia, 35-36, 115
 Public: libraries, 55, 130-131, 150, 156; schools, 158
 Publication procurement officers, 63, 68, 81, 88, 106
 Publications, exchange of. (*See* Exchange; Lists); international clearinghouse for, 90, 94; processed, 25, 78; society, 67, 97, 110; wartime, xvi-xvii, 51-54, 120-121, 148-150
 Publications Foundation, 148
 Publishers, xix, 5-6, 10-11, 19-20, 46, 53, 58, 71, 85, 88, 91, 96, 100-108, 110-117, 119-120, 123-128, 132, 150, 153, 155, 157
 Publishers Guild, 103
Publishers' Weekly, 6, 11-12
 Punched cards, 10, 26, 49
 Purchasing: cooperative, 55-66; 70, 106; coordinated (*See* Specialization)
- Radio, 116-117
 Reading machines, 46, 48, 51-52
 Record manufacturers, 116-117
 Reduced facsimile. *See* Photographic Reproduction
 Regional union catalogues, 7-9, 14-15, 44-45, 49
 Registration, copyright, 115, 119-120
 Rehabilitation, xviii, xx, 51, 93, 108, 120-121, 139, 143-154
 Reparations, 52
 Repertory of translators, 101
 Replacements, 55, 145
 Reprints: for export, 103; from serials, 23, 49
 Reproduction, photographic. *See* Photographic reproduction
 Republication, xvi-xvii, 46-47, 50, 52-53, 57, 77, 103, 148, 150; *See also* Photographic reproduction
 Research councils, 22, 148
 "Research value," 65
 Réseau universel, 24
 Resources: guide to, xvii, 8-9; surveys of, 9, 39, 59, 61, 157
 Restoration *versus* rehabilitation, 147, 151, 153
 Restrictions. *See* Barriers
 Retrospective bibliography, xv, 6, 11, 26, 31
 Rockefeller Foundation, 8, 46, 51, 90, 129, 138, 140, 146, 156

- Rome, American Library in, 127
 Rome Congress, 5, 10, 19-20, 22-23, 37, 40, 75, 86, 101, 109-110, 113, 118, 126, 139
 Royal Society, 19-20, 22
 Royal Society of Medicine, 51
 Royalties, 101, 103, 121, 149
 Rumania, 74-75, 100
 Russia, 10, 40, 93, 105, 117, 121, 128, 148
 Russian: abstracting needs, 31-32; exchanges, 63, 74, 87, 91; purchases, 66, 102, 104
 Salvador, 75
 São Paulo Library School, 138
 Sardinia, 115
 Scandinavian documents, 82
 Schools: library, 68, 134-142, 156; public, 158
Schweizerischer Zeitschriften- und Zeitungskatalog, 67
 Science Library, 18, 20
 Screening of students, 136-137, 142
 Selective bibliography: xvi, 4-5, 11, 13-14, 101, 104-105, 153; library cooperation on, 29, 55-56, 60; of translations, 102, 107; summaries of progress as, 18, 25-26, 28-31
 Selectivity: in document collecting, 78; in exchanges, 92; in Farmington plan, 64-65; in indexing and abstracting, 18, 26-27, 29
 Separates, 23, 49
 Serbia, 74
 Serials: copyright interests of publishers of, 116-117; exchange of (*See* Exchange); format of, 19, 49, 51; indexing and abstracting of, xvi-xvii, 16-33, 52, 70, 148; lists of (*See* Lists); purchase of, 105-106, 110; republication or replacement of, xvii, 46-47, 51-53, 145-146, 150; specialization in, xvii, 58-60, 64, 66-67
 Services: documentation, 22, 39; indexing and abstracting, xvi-xvii, 18-19, 22-33, 48, 70, 148; photographic reproduction, 44-45, 147; *See also* Centres
 Shipping. *See* Transmission
 Smithsonian Institution, xviii, 70, 73, 76, 79, 84-85, 91-93, 98-99, 110
 Social Science Research Council, 29, 133, 136, 146, 153-154, 159
 Society publications, 67, 97, 110
 Sorbonne, 86
 Sorting, mechanical, 10, 19-20, 26, 49
 South Africa, 139-140
 Soviet State Library for Foreign Literature, 128
 Spain, 74, 113, 125-126
 Special collections. *See* Resources
 Special Libraries Association, xvi
 Specialization: by American libraries, xvii-xviii, 6, 11, 32, 57-70, 76-78, 82, 88, 92, 106, 113, 132, 152, 156; by other libraries, xx, 58-59, 86, 112, 148, 151; principles of, 8, 34-35, 40, 42, 55, 57-61, 64-65
 Standardization: bibliographical 5, 10, 14, 19-21; of paper, 105-106; of reproduction, 44, 50-51; of statistics and terminology, 118
 State: documents, 76-77, 80-82; libraries, 112
 Stationers' Company, 111
 Statistics: bibliographical, 6-7, 12, 118-119; exchange, 75; loan, 36, 38
 Stereotype plates, 9-10, 19, 35
 Storage warehouses, 34, 38, 89
 Students, 135-138, 140-142, 146
 Study: of acquisitions from eight countries, 61-62, 65, 135; of barriers, xix, 121-123; of document exchange distribution, xvii-xviii, 78-80; of exchanges, xviii, 87, 91, 96; of exhibits, xix, 130, 132; of Hungarian publications, 67-68; of indexing and abstracting, 24, 26; of personnel exchanges, 137-138, 141-143; of photographic reproduction, xvii, 49-51, 53; *See also* Surveys
 Stuttgart, American Library in, 129
 Stuttgart Conference, 87, 147
 Subject: bibliography, xvi-xviii, 5, 7-10, 16-33, 39, 47-49, 52, 61, 68-70, 148; catalogues (published), xvii, 28, 31, 69-70; exhibits, 124, 130; information centres, 39, 86; libraries, 23-26, 113; lists of serials, 16; organizations, xvii, 22-24, 26, 57, 88, 148; union catalogues, 7-9, 16, 61, 68-70
 Subscriptions, 105-106
 Subsidies: for bibliography, 5, 22, 26, 30; for Boyd proposal, 157; for exchange, 91, 96-99, 105; for personnel, 143; for rehabilitation, 146; for specialization, 59; for translation, 101-102; through postal rates, 105, 110
 Summaries of progress, 18, 25-26, 28-31
 Surveys: of American libraries abroad, xx, 130, 132-133; of book production, 61-62, 67-68; of foreign libraries, 139; of projects interrupted by war, 148, 150; of republication needs, 52-53, 148, 150; of resources, 9, 39, 59, 61, 157; *See also* Study
 Sweden, 65, 75, 87, 100

- Swiss serials list, 67
 Switzerland, 7, 40, 65-66, 74, 112, 130
- Tariff: on importations, xix, 103, 110-111, 121-123; on loans, 40
 Taxation, 114, 118
 Telephotic transmission, 50
 Terminology, 118, 138
 Theatre librarians, 119
 Theological libraries, 60
 Theses, 48, 85-86
 Trade barriers, xix, 40, 103-104, 110-111, 121-123, 132
 Trading with the Enemy Act, 70
 Translation: copyright protection of, 117, 121; of abstracts and bibliographies, 13-14, 32-33; of books, xix, 100-104, 106-108, 137
 Transliteration, 10
 Transmission: of document exchanges, 73-76; of loans, xvii, 37-39, 41-42; of non-document exchanges, xviii, 70, 84-85, 91-93, 98-99; telephotic, 50
 Travel, 52, 103, 137-139, 142, 150
 Treasure Chest Campaign, 146
 Treaties and agreements: establishing cultural institutes, 38; on copyright, 113, 115-117, 121, 148-149; on exchange, 73-79, 84, 86, 92; on exhibits, 125; on loans, 36; on personnel exchanges, 136, 139; on postage and tariff, 105, 110, 121; on selective bibliography, 5; on translation, 100-101, 108
- U.S.A. Book News*, 104
 Ukraine, 112
 Union Académique Internationale, 24
 Union Catalogue, American National, xiii, xvi-xvii, 8-9, 35, 41, 45, 60-61
 Union catalogues: national author, 5, 7-10, 14-15, 25, 36, 38-40, 58-59; regional, 7-9, 14-15, 44-45, 49; subject, 7-9, 16, 61, 68-70; world, 5, 9, 14, 24
 Union Internationale pour la Protection des Oeuvres Littéraires et Artistiques, 118
Union List of Microfilms, 44-45
Union List of Serials, 9, 16, 89
 Union lists: of accessions, 39; of serials, 9, 14-15, 39, 58, 60
 Union of Translators, 102
 Union Postale Universelle, 105
 United Nations, 94-95, 149
 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, xv-xvi, xix-xx, 3, 5-6, 11-15, 24-26, 30, 40, 45, 49-50, 53, 61, 67, 77, 90, 92, 94, 97, 100, 106, 108, 113, 119, 121-122, 144, 147-148, 150-151, 153, 155, 157-158
 United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, 25
 United States Alien Property Custodian, 47, 53, 148
 United States Army Medical Library, 17, 23, 35, 70, 88
 United States Bureau of Standards, 106
 United States Congress, xviii-xix, 73, 82, 84, 91, 96-99, 109-110, 117, 142-143
 United States Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 102, 126
 United States Copyright Office, xvi, 6-7, 12, 115, 117
 United States Department of Agriculture, 23, 27, 30, 53, 67-68, 70, 80-82, 88, 104, 141
 United States Department of Commerce, 104
 United States Department of State, xviii-xix, 45, 56, 62-63, 68, 80-81, 88, 90, 101-102, 104-106, 108, 112, 122-123, 126-129, 131, 133, 136, 141-142, 146-147, 155-156, 158-159; *See also* Libraries abroad
 United States Exchange Office, 88, 92, 95-97
 United States Government Printing Office, 81-82
 United States International Book Association, 88, 105-107, 128, 132, 150, 153
 United States National Commission . . . *See* National Commission . . .
 United States Navy Department, xix, 71
 United States Office of Education, 126-127, 136, 142
 United States Office of Strategic Services, 65
 United States Office of War Information, 4, 127, 129
United States Quarterly Book List, xiii, 4, 13-14, 31, 91, 96
 United States Register of Copyrights, xvi, 6-7, 12, 115, 117
 United States Superintendent of Documents, xvi, 81, 94
 United States Treasury Department, xix, 70, 123
 United States War Department: xix, 70-71, 93, 106, 108, 120-121, 133; Military Government in Germany, 124, 129, 133, 143
 United States Works Progress Administration, 22
 Universal bibliography and catalogue, 5, 9, 14, 24

- Universal Decimal Classification, 20-22
- Universal library, 24, 47, 112
- Universities, 5, 57, 72, 91, 157; *See also* Exchange
- University: presses, 85, 91, 96, 127; students, 135-138, 140-142, 146
- University Microfilms, Inc., 46, 48
- Uppsala, University of, 83-85, 109
- Uruguay, 74, 126
- Vatican, 138-139
- Vattemare exchange system, 84
- Versailles Treaty, 149
- Visits, 103, 137-139, 142, 150
- Want lists, xvi, 86, 88-89, 92, 94
- War damage, 145, 150-151
- Warehouses, 34, 38, 89
- Washington Documents Center, xix, 71
- Wilson Company, 6; 89
- Women's Council for Post-War Europe, 146
- Work in progress, 23
- World: encyclopedia, 49; libraries, 24, 47, 112; library centre, 23, 25; list of serials, xvi, 14-15, 30, 67, 95; union catalogue, 5, 9, 14, 24; *See also* International
- World Congress of Libraries and Bibliography, 5, 10, 19-20, 22-23, 36-37, 40, 75, 86, 101, 109-110, 113, 118, 126, 134-135, 139, 141
- World Congress of Universal Documentation, 134
- Yale University, 60, 85, 131
- Yugoslavia, 101, 139

THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, established in 1876, is an organization of libraries, librarians, library trustees and others interested in the responsibilities of libraries in the educational, social and cultural needs of society. It is affiliated with more than fifty other library associations in this country and abroad. It works closely with many organizations concerned with education, recreation, research, and public service. Its activities are carried on by a headquarters staff, voluntary boards and committees, and by divisions, sections, and round tables, all interested in various aspects or types of library service. Its program includes information and advisory services, personnel service, field work, annual and mid-winter conferences, and the publication—not for profit—of numerous professional books, pamphlets and periodicals.